


THE HISTORY OF THE PAPACY
IN THE XIXTH CENTURY

DR FREDRIK NIELSEN



BX1386

.N667

v.1


copy 1

81 Pafacy

F. M. Gray

May 1923.

THE HISTORY OF THE PAPACY
IN THE XIXTH CENTURY



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

THE HISTORY OF THE PAPACY IN THE XIXTH CENTURY

BY DR FREDRIK NIELSEN

BISHOP OF AALBORG, AND FORMERLY PROFESSOR OF ECCLESIASTICAL
HISTORY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF COPENHAGEN

TRANSLATED UNDER THE DIRECTION OF
ARTHUR JAMES MASON, D.D.

MASTER OF PEMBROKE COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE


VOL I

INTRODUCTION, PIUS VII

LONDON

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.

1906



EXTRACT FROM THE AUTHOR'S PREFACE TO
VOLUME II. OF THE SECOND DANISH
EDITION

(VOLUME I. WAS PUBLISHED WITHOUT A PREFACE)

THIS Second Edition of *Pavedømmet i den nittende Hundredaar* is so different from the first that it may almost be called a new book. Besides the introductory section, practically the whole of the second volume is printed from a fresh manuscript, and that part of the first volume, the history of Pius VII., for which the former edition served as a basis, contains many pages that are wholly new, and only few which have not received some addition or alteration. When I first put forth this sketch of the modern Papacy, I had never seen Rome, and I hardly knew the Roman Church except through books. I owe it to the Ministry for Ecclesiastical and Educational Affairs, and the Carlsberg Fund, that in repeated visits to Italy, Germany, France, and Belgium, of longer or shorter duration, I have been enabled to make studies for this work, and to become personally acquainted with several of the men who have taken a part in making the recent history of the Papacy.

It was my idea to conclude my account with a brief view of the chief points in the papacy of Leo XIII., like those pages in the First Edition which dealt with the years immediately following the Vatican Council. But I have abandoned that design for several reasons. . . . When I came to put down on paper the last portion of my work, I saw clearly that the right appreciation of a papacy which, like that of Leo XIII., is largely occupied with the solution of diplomatic problems

viii EXTRACT FROM AUTHOR'S PREFACE

and the publication of Encyclicals on social questions, could not be formed without going pretty fully into things. It is my hope before long to be able to offer such a representation, which would then serve as an independent supplement to this book, and so to fulfil a desire which has been expressed on many sides.

The completion of the book, contrary to my desire, has been deferred. The delay has been caused partly by one or two large and unforeseen interruptions in my daily work, partly by the extent of the literature that had to be mastered, and by frequent difficulties in obtaining the sources which have been used in the concluding sections. I had reached the middle of my work before I received such important contributions to the later history of the Papacy as Purcell's *Life of Cardinal Manning* (2 vols., London 1895), the last volume of Ricasoli's *Lettere e documenti* (Firenze 1895), the first portions of the *Rivista storica del risorgimento Italiano* (Torino 1895f.), which contain amongst other things extracts from Castagnola's accounts of the ministerial conferences in 1870, and Nigra's *Ricordi diplomatici del 1870* (in the *Nuova Antologia* for 1st March 1895). I felt that it would be inexcusable to finish the book before this new material had been worked into the account, but this required time.

HORNBÆK, 18th August 1898.

EDITOR'S PREFACE

THE Author of this book, Dr Fredrik Nielsen, was born at Aalborg in the year 1846. After being ordained in 1873, he was appointed in 1877 Professor of Divinity (Ecclesiastical History) in the University of Copenhagen. The year before his appointment to that post the first edition of this book was published. The second and much altered edition came out, one volume at a time, in 1895 and 1898. Two years after this latter date, he was appointed Bishop of his native town of Aalborg. He had not been Bishop of Aalborg more than five years when the government offered him the see of Odense, in Fyen. It was an attractive offer. The see of Odense is better endowed than that of Aalborg. It has an interesting cathedral, and it lies several hours nearer to Copenhagen and its libraries. But Bishop Nielsen felt that his work at Aalborg was not yet done, and he refused the offer. Last year, the government made a fresh proposal. Aarhus is the chief town of Jylland or Continental Denmark, and the second largest city in the kingdom. Its cathedral rivals Roskilde in beauty, if it does not excel it. Important educational schemes are under consideration, involving probably the creation of a new university at Aarhus, and the government felt that no one could so well superintend the carrying out of such a project as Bishop Nielsen. Yielding to pressure from many quarters, Bishop Nielsen consented to the translation, and now presides over the important diocese of Aarhus.

The appointment is as honourable to the Danish government as to Bishop Nielsen. The Bishop is not a man who has laid himself out to find favour with people in high position. His outspoken dislike of Freemasonry, in the form which it assumes on the Continent, is said to have made him an object of dislike in eminent places, and it was for a long time thought that the Court would be opposed to his advancement. On the other hand, he is no adherent of the Radical government which has now been for some years in power; but that government placed him on the important commission, which is engaged in drawing up a constitution for the Danish Church (*Kirkeforfatning*), of which, along with Skat Rørdam, Bishop of Sjælland, he is the leading spirit; and it is the same government which has now brought about his translation to Aarhus.

Dr Nielsen was much influenced in his earlier days by the Grundtvigian revival in the Danish Church. The main feature of that revival was a combination of evangelical and spiritual fervour with a strong insistence upon the doctrine contained in the Apostles' Creed and the Lutheran formularies. Other things which were characteristic of Grundtvigianism the Bishop of Aarhus has left behind, if he was ever affected by them; but he has lost none of the warm whole-hearted Christian earnestness which marked the movement. His position may be said to be that of a large-minded and statesman-like High Churchman among ourselves. How wide is his outlook upon contemporary church life is shown by these volumes themselves. He was on terms of intimate friendship with Döllinger during the lifetime of that great scholar. Though he has never visited England, he reads every important work that appears in this country of a theological, philosophical, or historical kind, and regularly follows the course of events in England with the keenest sympathy and insight.

There are many points of resemblance between the position of the Church of Denmark and that of our own Church at home, although the Danish Church makes no claim to have preserved a strictly episcopal succession, and there is, perhaps, no other body of Christians outside England, which looks upon things so nearly as we do ourselves. Standing a little off from the main currents of European thought, the Danish students and theologians, while sharing to the full the powers of hard work and the thoroughness of investigation, which are so conspicuous in the German universities, are able to exercise an independent judgment upon the problems under discussion. They bring to bear upon them a singularly useful combination of faculties. There is something eminently sane and sensible in their mental constitution, partly owing, it may be, to the poetic warmth of heart, which belongs to the Scandinavian races, and to that rich vein of humour which sees the absurdities into which a narrow logic is liable to betray the schools of "rigour and vigour." They are clear thinkers, without being misled, as some men are, by the very clearness with which their views present themselves. Practical considerations exercise with them a wholesome influence upon theory. Their language is rich in literature of the highest order, and it is a misfortune that so few English people are acquainted with it.

The present work is intended to form part of a larger whole. Bishop Nielsen hopes within the present year to finish a third volume, dealing with the pontificate of Leo XIII., and thus completing the history of the Nineteenth Century. But besides this, he has already published, in 1881, the first volume of a work on the internal history of the Roman Church during the same period. This first volume of *Det indre Liv* brings the account down to the year 1830. The indefatigable author hopes, as soon as the third volume of *Pavedømmet* is done, to

proceed at once with the next portion of the *Indre Liv*. The whole will then form a complete history of *Romerkirken i det nittende Hundrebaar*, the Church of Rome in the Nineteenth Century.

Besides this important work, Dr Nielsen has published an admirable History of the Church in two large volumes (*Haandbog i Kirkens Historie*), the first (*Old Kirken*) dealing with the Patristic period, the second (*Middelalderen*) with the period from Gregory the Great to the eve of the Reformation. This book has reached its fifth edition, and has been translated not only into German, but also into Magyar and Slovenian. He published a volume of Essays and Reviews (*Karakteristiker og Kritiker*) in 1884, and one on Church and State (*Statskirke og Frikirke*) in the year before. In 1889, he published an interesting account of the religious development of Gruntvig (*N. F. S. Grundtvigs religiøse Udvikling*). He has contributed a good deal, especially on northern subjects, to Hauck's (Herzog's) German *Realencyclopädie*, and is the author besides of a large number of *Smaaskrifter*, on Undenominational Schools, Modern Judaism, Free Thought, Freemasonry, and similar subjects, as well as papers of a biographical character.

The translation now offered to English readers is the work of different hands, and the execution of it has been long delayed. I began the translation myself some ten years ago, but soon found that other duties made it impossible for me to make quick progress with it. At my request the work was taken over by Miss Ingeborg Muller, now Mrs Molesworth St Aubyn, of Clowance, in Cornwall. She, too, was much hindered in her kindly accepted task, and was obliged after some time to give it up. I then obtained the help of the Rev. A. V. Storm, formerly Danish Chaplain in London, and now Pastor of the Citadel Church in Copenhagen. His work,

extending through the whole of the second volume, and part of the first, has been carefully revised by Mr and Mrs J. F. Caroe of Blundellsands ; but I have gone over the whole work again with the original, practically re-writing a good deal of it. My best thanks are due to those who have contributed so much time and pains to the book as it now stands.

I earnestly desire that the English book may serve, besides other purposes, to draw nearer to each other the Churches of England and of Scandinavia, which, if any, are *faites pour se connaître et s'aimer*.

A. J. MASON.

CANTERBURY, *March* 1906.

CONTENTS

CHAP.	PAGE
I. JANSENISM AND GALRICANISM	I
II. <i>L'ESPRIT PHILOSOPHIQUE</i> AND JESUITISM	24
III. THE ABOLITION OF THE ORDER OF THE JESUITS	56
IV. ALFONSO MARIA DE' LIGUORI	88
V. FEBRONIANISM AND JOSEPHINISM	109
VI. THE FRENCH REVOLUTION	137
VII. PIUS VI.	165
VIII. PIUS VII.—THE CONCLAVE IN VENICE	191
IX. THE CONCORDAT WITH FRANCE	219
X. THE CORONATION OF THE EMPEROR	260
XI. THE RUPTURE BETWEEN THE EMPEROR AND THE POPE	283
XII. IMPRISONMENT AND RELEASE	301
XIII. RESTORATION AND REACTION	340

THE HISTORY OF THE PAPACY

CHAPTER I

JANSENISM AND GALLICANISM

THE nineteenth century rose dark and threatening for the Roman Church. In February 1798, under the protection of French arms, the inhabitants of Rome had proclaimed the Republic, and when, in August 1799, Pius VI. died at Valence, in French captivity, eight months passed away before a successor was found, so that at the change of century the Roman Church was without a head.

And the new Pope immediately met with difficulties on every side. The ancient power and influence of the Papacy seemed to be completely annihilated in the chief Roman Catholic countries, and almost everywhere the earlier reverence for the chair of St Peter had given way to indifference, or to an ill-will, which for a long time had been growing great and strong.

Nowhere was the change of sentiment towards Rome more marked than in France; but in that country many different circumstances had contributed to loosen the ancient bond between the head of the Roman Church and the Church of France—the eldest daughter of Rome.

Louis XIV. had been the defender and support of the Church. It is true that after Mazarin's death he had not thought it necessary to choose a new Cardinal-Minister, but he had himself continued the policy of the cardinals. Like another Constantine or Theodosius, he sought to promote the cause of the Church, and he never renounced his Jesuit

education. He compelled all the members of his household to seek their confessors amongst the disciples of Ignatius Loyola;¹ and both politicians and courtiers found his favour more easily, if they had entrusted the guidance of their consciences to Jesuits. Until Madame de Maintenon gained power over him, and thereby acquired an unique influence upon ecclesiastical affairs, all French sees were filled in his reign according to the suggestion of the Jesuit confessors. In all directions, even in the furthest Missions, the members of the Society of Jesus could count upon the help of France; and they showed their gratitude towards the great King who was so favourable to them by spreading his praises and defending his policy; so that at Rome complaints were made, that the genius of Jesuitism had become enthusiastic for the destinies of France, but was ill disposed towards the Pope, because he had condemned so many of the moral propositions of the Jesuits.²

But in spite of the guidance of the Jesuit confessors, the new Constantine betrayed many of the weaknesses which clung to the old; and Saint-Simon was not the only one who complained that the Court of Louis XIV. *suait l'hypocrisie*. Fénelon in a courageous letter told his King that his life had practically removed him "out of the way of truth and righteousness, and in consequence out of the way of the Gospel,"³ and Madame de Maintenon wrote later to the Archbishop of Paris: "Religion is but little known at Court. People wish to shape it to suit themselves, instead of directing themselves according to it. They only trouble themselves about all its external observances, not about the spirit of it. The King will never fail to keep a station or a fast, but he will not understand that one ought to humble oneself and to be filled with a true spirit of penitence, and that we must clothe ourselves in sackcloth and ashes to pray for peace."⁴ Careful observers easily saw that the King's zeal for the good of the French Church was not so much owing to a deeply-rooted conviction of the truth of the Roman Catholic

¹ I. v. Döllinger: *Die Politik Ludwigs XIV.* in *Akad. Vorträge* (Nördlingen 1888) I, 278; Sicard: *L'ancien clergé de France* (Paris 1893) I, 230.

² Thus Cardinal Sfondrati. F. H. Reusch: *Beiträge zur Gesch. des Jesuitenordens* (Munich 1894), 83.

³ *Correspondance de Fénelon* (Paris 1827) II, 336.

⁴ *Corresp. de Mme. de Maintenon* par Th. Lavallée (Paris 1866) IV, 308f.

doctrine, as to the fact that this religion was the King's religion, so that to diverge from it was to rebel against the King's absolute sovereignty. And even if Louis XIV. did not possess the same unbounded power in the ecclesiastical realm as in that of the State, Fénelon was undoubtedly right when he asserted that his King had more power over the Church than the Pope himself.¹ The embassy at Rome was in the eyes of Louis XIV. the most important of all the French embassies,² and the representative of France at the papal Court could always reckon upon the existence of a French party among the cardinals—*les cardinaux de la faction*³—who had so great an influence that no one was elected Pope who would not be a *persona grata* at Versailles. Every now and then there was variance between the successors of St Peter and Louis XIV.; but, in spite of all, that King to the last stood to the whole Roman Catholic world as the shield and protector of the Roman Church; and when he died Clement XI. publicly gave him the testimony that he had been possessed of all the Catholic virtues.⁴

This favourable judgment was particularly owing to Louis XIV.'s "ardent zeal for the faith." He had, as Clement XI. said, in the course of a few months rid the whole of France of the false Protestant faith, and had for many years with a strong hand defended the papal ordinances against Jansenism, and given them effect. The eventful revocation of the Edict of Nantes, which abolished Protestantism in the native country of Calvin, was in the eyes of Clement XI. a deed of faith which might cover many sins; and by his combat against Jansenism Louis XIV. had done an equally great service to the Papacy and to Jesuitism.

Cornelius Jansen, a native of the Netherlands, for some time Professor of Holy Scripture in the University of Louvain, who died Bishop of Ypres in 1638, had with great enthusiasm and intrepid perseverance advanced along the way which had been trodden before him by Michael Bajus. In opposition to the

¹ Döllinger: *Akad. Vorträge* I, 289.

² Instruction to Lavardin in *Recueil des Instructions. Rome*, par G. Hanotaux (Paris 1888), 287.

³ *Ibid.*, 289, 349.

⁴ Döllinger: *Akad. Vorträge* I, 289.

Pelagianism—whole or half—of the dominant theology, he maintained Augustine's doctrine with regard to sin and grace. Ten times he had read through the many folio volumes which contained the writings of the African bishop. The treatises against the Pelagians he had laboured through as often as thirty times; and in the course of this profound study of the Augustinian literature, that great Doctor of the Church had come to be to him an authority incapable of being shaken, like an inspired evangelist who had done the same for the right recognition of divine grace as the Evangelist John had done for the recognition of the Divinity of the Word. In a folio published two years after his death under the title of *Augustinus*, he set forth his views concerning a reformation to be accomplished by reviving the doctrine of Augustine. According to him, the contemporary theologians understood neither the fall of man nor grace, neither the Old nor the New Testament; but he hoped by following Augustine and gaining a hearing for conversion, faith, and inward religion, to be able to make head against the externalism of the Jesuits, and to produce an inner regeneration of the Church. With great acuteness and zeal for the truth, he hunted down Pelagianism in the said work in all its disguises, because in his eyes Pelagianism was the ruin of all true piety and of all genuine morality. A short time previously, the friend of his youth and his companion in studies, Jean du Vergier d'Hauranne, Abbot of the Benedictine Convent of St Cyran, had, under the name of Petrus Aurelius, in several essays which were afterwards collected into a book, developed his views about the right constitution of the Church as an episcopal aristocracy, in opposition to the papal absolutism which was the Jesuit ideal.

In spite of this return to Augustine, and in spite of their criticism of the Jesuit theology and ethics, Cornelius Jansen and St Cyran were anything but protestant-minded. It was not the evangelical passages in Augustine which made such an impression upon them. They shared in the fullest measure the Jesuits' hatred of Protestantism, and they used their brilliant pens to combat its adherents. Jansen had even written a pamphlet sharply attacking Richelieu, because France under his direction had allied itself with the Swedish and

German Protestants, and he had a great reputation in Spain, the mother country of the Counter Reformation. But his *Augustinus* undeniably contained expressions calculated to cause offence amongst those who wished to defend the Pope's infallibility.

Cornelius Jansen was confronted with this difficulty:—in the case of Michael Bajus and his Augustinianism, Rome, which appeared to set the African Doctor so high, had condemned Augustinian propositions which, so far from being casual utterances, might be said to form the basis of the whole system of Augustine. Instead of submitting himself unconditionally to the papal decision on such points, Jansen expressed the surmise that Rome's condemnation only sprang from a love of peace, or that the disapproval on Rome's part only meant that the assertions of Augustine were inopportune, not that they were false or heretical. And he himself on these points sided with Augustine against Rome. He ended his book with a comparison between the semi-Pelagian divines of the old days and his contemporaries, Less, Molina, and Vasquez; and, as if to protect himself against all contingencies, he finally insisted with great force that the thoughts which he had worked out were not his own, but were derived from Augustine.¹

The Jesuits had read Cornelius Jansen's book before it appeared. By the help of a printer's man they had obtained possession of the proof-sheets.² As soon as they saw what it contained, they turned to the papal nuncio and besought him to hinder the spread of the Jansenist poison, and the book was accordingly at once prohibited by a decree from the Inquisition. But the Council in Brabant would not submit to this decree, and not even a papal Bull of 1642, which forbade the book and referred to the earlier bulls against Michael Bajus, could reduce the University of Louvain to obedience.³ Even after the papal Bull had been acknowledged by King Philip IV.

¹ P. 1070. With regard to his relation to the Papacy, see, besides the older literature, A. Vandenpeereboom: *Cornelius Jansen, septième évêque d'Ypres* (Bruges 1882), and: *Jansenius, évêque d'Ypres, ses derniers moments, sa soumission au S. Siège, d'après des documents inédits* (Louvain 1893).

² Crétineau-Joly: *Hist. de la Compagnie de Jésus* (Paris 1859) IV, 18.

³ F. H. Reusch: *Der Index der verbotenen Bücher* (Bonn 1885) II, 457f.

in 1651, some of the bishops of the Netherlands, with the Archbishop of Malines at their head, protested that a condemnation of Cornelius Jansen's book would be a condemnation of Augustine.

Before the prelates of the Netherlands were reduced to submit to the Bull of 1642, accompanied as it was by the King's licence, eighty-five French bishops had applied to Rome to obtain a condemnation of certain specified passages in Jansen's book. Innocent X., who was Pope at the time, was much more of a jurist than of a theologian; but as St Peter's successor, he believed himself to be placed under the direct influence of the Holy Ghost,¹ and on the strength of this he considered himself qualified to explain all the depths of Scripture and to solve all scholastic problems. At the outset indeed he had had no particular desire to meddle with this strife.² He excused himself by saying that he was old, and that he had never studied theology (*non ho mai studiato teologia*). But after repeated persuasions he gave way, and in 1653 published a Bull which condemned five propositions in the *Augustinus*.

With this new Bull, the battle over Cornelius Jansen's book became a contest concerning the limits of the papal infallibility. Jansen's adherents, with Antoine Arnauld at their head, would not deny that the five condemned propositions were in themselves objectionable, but they affirmed that the propositions were not found in Jansen in the form which the Pope condemned, and with regard to this point of fact (*point de fait*) they would not submit to the papal authority, but contented themselves with observing a respectful silence (*silence respectueux*). As Arnauld would go no further in the way of submission, he was ejected from the Sorbonne, and Pope Alexander VII. published in 1656 a third Bull which confirmed the decision of his predecessor. But this Bull made no more impression upon the Jansenists than the earlier ones, and their views won more and more adherents. After Arnauld's ejection from the Sorbonne, Pascal began the publication of his *Provincial Letters*, and beyond the borders of the Nether-

¹ He remarked to some theologians of Paris: "Tutto questo dipende dall' ispirazione dello Spirito Santo." Döllinger: *Das Papstthum* (Munich 1892), 507.

² Reusch: *Index II*, 469.

lands and of France Jansenism made its appearance in Spain and Italy and Austria. Under Innocent X. a doctor from the Sorbonne even dared to defend the heretic of the Netherlands in the church of St Louis at Rome, until his mouth was stopped by the Jesuits.¹

In order to give universal effect in France to the Bull of 1656 Alexander VII., with the approval of Louis XIV., composed a formula to be subscribed by all French bishops, priests, monks, and nuns. By assenting to it, the subscribers submitted to the decisions of Rome with regard to the five condemned propositions. In order to get all to subscribe, the Pope was obliged to see many do so with reservations. But a disagreement between Louis XIV. and the Papacy for a time withdrew attention from Jansenism.

Ever since the days of Hugh Capet, the French bishops had complained of Rome's encroachments, and had made much of the comparative independence of the Gallican Church with regard to Rome, in which sentiment they had the sympathies of the Crown. In the days of Henry IV. (1594), when the reaction against the League had again exalted the Crown, and when the thought of the power and significance of the State had gained greater distinctness, Pithou had collected the documents upon which were founded the so-called Gallican rights.² The programme of Gallicanism turned upon these two chief propositions; that the Kings of France were in secular matters independent of the Pope; and that the Pope's spiritual authority was limited by the laws of the Church. From the first proposition they concluded that the King, as the born protector of the Church, had the right of calling together national and provincial Councils in his dominions, in order with their help to legislate for the Church, and that the Pope's Bulls could not be published in France without the King's consent (*pareatis, placet*). Gallicanism took a strong hold, partly because the bishops were indisposed to submit to Rome, and partly because the sense which the Parliaments entertained of their own independence was steadily on the increase; and with the national movement in the beginning

¹ L. v. Ranke: *Die römischen Päpste*, 8th ed. (Leipzig 1885) I, 92.

² Cp. Hanotaux' Introduction to the *Recueil des Instructions*, mentioned above, xcvi.

of the 17th century the Gallican theory gained still more adherents. The Gallicans were then called *Les Français*, *Les Bons Français*, and if men were wanted to defend in the schools the ultramontane conception of the rights of the Popes, they had to be fetched from the Netherlands or from Germany; for most Frenchmen considered it to be *crimen læsæ patriæ*.

The Crown gained much by the spread of Gallicanism. Gallicanism was to no small degree promoted by legists who had studied the Roman law and who sought to introduce the conceptions of Roman law into French territory. Without reserve it allowed to the King divine authority and made him the equal of the Pope. The Holy Ghost, the Gallican said, chooses the Pope in the Conclave, but He chooses the King also, and that from his mother's womb. On the strength of his divine authority the King is lord over the property of the Church, and in this way he acquires the means to satisfy the nobles, and to keep the third estate in check. But power brings its duties. Just as the Roman Empire from the beginning was tinged with a spiritual character, so the Most Christian King in France had, according to the theory of the Gallicans, ecclesiastical obligations. He was not only bound to watch over Church and school, but also to extirpate all heresies. Therefore the Gallican divines and lawyers found that it was all as it should be, when Louis XIV. got rid of Protestantism out of France, and Richelieu's alliance with the foreign Protestants roused their displeasure.

Gallicanism reached its height under Louis XIV. The Gallican theory concerning the origin and rights of the Crown gave the basis for his autocracy. He believed fully in his ecclesiastical mission, but he also took a firm stand upon the fundamental Gallican propositions. When Ultramontaniam began to raise its head, the Sorbonne fearlessly declared (in 1663) that it was not the doctrine of that renowned faculty that the Pope had any authority whatever over the Most Christian King in secular concerns, or that the Pope could take any measures which conflicted with the law of the French Church. At the same time the Sorbonne repudiated the assertion that the Pope was above a General Council, or could be infallible without the consent of the Church (*nullo accedente*

Ecclesiæ consensu).¹ This declaration was confirmed by Louis XIV., and he forbade any other teaching in his kingdom. Following upon this, the Sorbonne pronounced censure upon several works of an ultramontane tendency, and when Alexander VII. in a severe Bull disapproved of the censure, the Parliament of Paris, with the King's consent, opposed the publication of the papal Bull.

This strife, which died away in diplomatic negotiations, was only a prelude to a far more serious conflict between Gallicanism and Ultramontanism. Louis XIV. had for a long time made the religious orders feel his power, without paying any attention to the complaints of Rome, and he had, without scruple, laid hands upon the possessions of the Church.² The ancient *droit de régle* allowed the Crown to enjoy the revenues of a vacant bishopric until the new bishop had registered his oath of allegiance, and in the meantime to dispose of the livings dependent upon the vacant see. This right Louis wished to extend to those French provinces where it had never been recognised.³ Innocent XI. endeavoured time after time to induce him to refrain from such encroachments, but in vain. At last he resorted to threats. In a brief of 27th December 1679, he intimated that he would use all the means which God had placed in his hands. But these words made no impression upon Louis XIV., who found defenders of Gallicanism even amongst the French Jesuits.⁴ His Jesuit confessors, who had the nomination of the French bishops in their hands, saw in the extension of the *droit de régle* an extension of their own power and of that of their order, which had the special advantage of putting them in position to prevent the hated Jansenists from obtaining still more preferments, and accordingly Jesuits like René Rapin and Louis Maimbourg defended the King's proceedings without scruple. When the General of the Jesuits, at the instigation of Innocent XI., summoned Maimbourg and Louis XIV.'s confessor, La Chaise, to Rome, the two Jesuits, in spite of the promise

¹ Reusch : *Index* II, 552f.

² C. Gérin : *Louis XIV. et le Saint-Siège* (Paris 1894) II, 129f., 234f., 527f., 486f.

³ G. J. Phillips : *Das Regalienrecht in Frankreich* (Halle 1873), 150f. ; L. de Fouchier : *Hist. du droit de Régle* (Paris 1893), 149f.

⁴ Reusch : *Beiträge zur Gesch. des Jesuitenordens*, 67f.

of their order, would not listen to the General's summons. Maimbourg continued to defend Louis XIV. so zealously that the Pope threatened the General of the Jesuits himself with deposition if he did not expel the daring author from his order, and enjoin penance upon those who had read his books upon the subject. When this intelligence reached Versailles, Louis XIV. was at first disposed to put difficulties in the way of Maimbourg's expulsion from the Society of Jesus; but on closer consideration he acquiesced in Maimbourg's quitting the order of his own apparent free will, on promise of a pension from the King.

At that time the French priesthood was assembled in synod at Paris (1681-1682). The Gallican spirit which prevailed amongst the prelates present displayed itself forthwith, when the Archbishop of Paris, after the opening service, said that the assembly had now fulfilled its duties towards its first religion (*aux devoirs de sa première religion*) by celebrating a Mass of the Holy Ghost, but that it remained to fulfil the duties of the second (*qu'il y avait une seconde religion à laquelle il fallait satisfaire*) which consisted in waiting upon the King.¹ The assembly approved of Louis XIV.'s extension of the *droit de régale*, and accepted the four Gallican propositions, which maintained that the secular power was independent of the spiritual, that a General Council was above the Pope, that the ancient rules of the Gallican Church were not to be violated, and that it was a valid affirmation that the Pope's decrees in matters of faith are only incapable of being reversed (*irreformables*) when they have the Church's assent (*Ecclesiæ consensu*).²

This famous Gallican declaration for a while obtained in France the authority of a religious formula. Louis XIV. made it the basis of religious instruction in all French schools, and required that everyone who wished to take a degree in divinity or law should take his oath to observe it.³ The Pope felt his spiritual authority greatly outraged by the four Gallican propositions, and never since the days of Francis I. had the relations between the papal power and the French

¹ Sicard: *L'ancien clergé de France* I, 103; following *Procès verbaux des assemblées du clergé* V, 373.

² E. Ollivier: *Nouveau manuel de droit ecclésiastique* (Paris 1886), 35f.

³ U. Maynard in the *Revue des questions historiques* VIII, 456f.

King been so strained. When Louis XIV. went on to fill the French sees with prominent members of this Gallican-minded synod, the patience of Innocent XI. gave way, and he refused to permit the new bishops to receive the canonical institution, without which they could not perform a bishop's duties. It was in vain that Louis XIV. sought to appease the angry Pope by crowning his persecutions of the Protestants with the treacherous revocation of the Edict of Nantes, the token of a complete break with Richelieu's policy, and forming a challenge to all the Protestant powers of Europe. Innocent XI. told him that Christ had used a different method of conversion, and that the moment for such a "mission" seemed unfortunately chosen, when the King himself was engaged in a violent strife with the Pope.¹ As Louis XIV. would not yield, Innocent at last laid an interdict upon the church of St Louis at Rome, where the French embassy used to hear Mass. By way of a rejoinder, Louis laid siege to Avignon, and appealed to a General Council: indeed it was actually said that he was minded to make the Archbishop of Paris, who was a Gallican, Patriarch of France.²

The situation at this time was so dangerous for Rome, that Innocent XI. in spite of his dislike of Protestantism found it expedient to promise great subsidies to the Prince of Orange, in the hope that he might defend the interests of the Roman Church against Louis XIV. upon the Rhine. By this means the Papacy unwillingly came to pave the Protestant prince's way to the English throne. On the other side, the strife with the Pope was the real cause of Louis XIV.'s enigmatic attack upon Germany. Perhaps he thought that the prospect of a great European war, the issues of which were uncertain, would make Innocent XI. more inclined to yield.³ But the war in the Palatinate had not the desired effect, and the seriousness of the circumstances soon compelled Louis XIV. to show a conciliatory disposition towards the Papacy. Already under Innocent XI.'s successor, Alexander VIII., he restored Avignon and opened negotiations. But not until the time of

¹ Ranke: *Röm. Päpste* III, 115: "all' ora che erano più bollenti le controversie col papa."

² The idea of a French Patriarchate was defended in the last days of Richelieu by the Jesuit Michel Rabardeau. Reusch: *Beiträge zur Gesch. des Jesuitenordens*, 62f.

³ So Ranke, *op. cit.* III, 117f.

Innocent XII. was peace with Rome concluded, upon the condition that the French bishops, who had hitherto been unable to obtain the recognition of Rome, should profess their "inexpressible grief" at the declaration of 1682, while Louis XIV. informed the Pope that he had given the necessary orders for depriving the four Gallican propositions of their rank as an authoritative formula in France.

Thus the Papacy came victorious out of the conflict; but the strife over the Gallican rights was nevertheless in the highest degree fraught with consequences for Rome. It could not easily be forgotten that the French priesthood and the French King had solemnly adopted Gallicanism, and that for half a score of years it had been inculcated into the French youth. The solemn proclamation of the propositions in 1682 was an event which aroused universal attention; but the revocation of them in 1693 had nothing striking about it. It took place without noise, as a statement on the part of certain bishops, and in a private letter from the King to the Pope. And even as early as 1697 Louis XIV. caused Cardinal Janson, his ambassador at the Court of Rome, to declare that he would not allow the papal infallibility to be taught in France.¹ In 1713 he went further, and stated that he had in fact only promised Innocent XII. that he would no longer enforce Gallicanism upon his subjects, but that he had never intended to wage war upon the Gallican view of questions which were, and, as he maintained, ought to be, open questions for all Frenchmen.²

After the conclusion of peace with Rome the battle against Jansenism came once more into prominence. The Jansenists, who were mystically disposed, had shown no particular interest in the King's Gallican Church policy, and in the dispute over the *régale* they had been on the Pope's side. The convent of Port Royal, a convent of Cistercian nuns in the valley of Yvette between Versailles and Chevreuse, which since the days of St Cyran had been "a nest of Jansenist error," had for this reason been made especially to feel the King's dislike. When the Countess of Grammont in 1699 had made her retreat among the nuns of Port Royal, she did not receive the usual invitation to Court. "People cannot come to Marly,

¹ A. Floquet : *Bossuet de 1670-1682* (Paris 1864), 572.

² Artaud : *Hist. du Pape Pie VII.* (Paris 1836) II, 17.

if they go to Port Royal," said Louis.¹ The Jesuits hated and feared the circle of brilliant writers who had attached themselves to Port Royal, and they egged the King on against this abode of Jansenism, which had gradually become the cradle of that literature which was shedding glory over his reign. Even Fénelon, who was usually gentleness itself, recommended the utmost severity towards the dangerous sect, which had spread far wider than most people imagined. At last Louis XIV. saw no other way than to beg Pope Clement XI. for a new Bull which should crush Jansenism altogether; and in 1705 Clement composed the Bull *Vineam Domini Sabaoth*. Before he solemnly published it, he despatched it into France, that the King might make corrections in it, and the royal *Placet* was thus assured beforehand.² So good had the relations between Rome and Versailles become, and such confidence was shown by the infallible Pope to the fallible King who had been the protector and defender of the Gallican heresy.

Clement XI.'s Bull contained an absolute condemnation of Jansenism; and because the nuns of Port Royal would only subscribe it with a reservation, their convent was doomed to destruction. Louis XIV. could not bear to have people near him who dared to withstand his royal will, and he begged the Pope for a new Bull giving permission for the dissolution of Port Royal. As soon as this Bull was published in 1709, he sent out the lieutenant of police from Paris, with a considerable force of men, against the two and twenty defenceless women at Port Royal, of whom the youngest was fifty years old, the eldest over eighty.³ Only the Prioress and one of the sisters steadily refused to subscribe; the others agreed to do so. Nevertheless, they were all removed from the convent, and the year after it was levelled with the ground. Not even the dead were permitted to rest in their graves in peace; many corpses were disinterred and treated with barbarous savagery.

The epic story of Jansenism was not ended, however, with the destruction of Port Royal, and the Jansenist question long continued to keep France in a disturbed state. Fénelon,

¹ Sainte-Beuve : *Port Royal* (Paris 1888) VI, 163.

² Reusch : *Index* II, 698.

³ Sainte-Beuve : *Port Royal* VI, 228f.

who followed the propaganda of the Jansenists with so much attention, wrote in 1705, in a private *mémoire* intended for the Pope: "In our Belgium there is scarcely a theologian of repute to be found who is not devoted to Jansenism; in Brussels, Douai, Liège, and Amsterdam, their worst books are printed with impunity. Almost all the booksellers sympathise with that party."¹ Five years later, in making an application to the Jesuit Le Tellier, who after the death of La Chaise became confessor to Louis XIV., he drew a similar picture of the progress of Jansenism. All those who had studied at the Sorbonne, with the sole exception of the members of the seminary of St Sulpice, many of the Benedictines, Oratorians, Augustinians, Carmelites, a good number of Capucins and Franciscans, many courtiers, and the majority of pious women, might, he said, be reckoned as belonging to the party of Cornelius Jansen.²

The Jesuits were not at all contented. Already, before the suppression of Port Royal, Clement XI. had published a prohibition of the translation of the New Testament, accompanied by edifying remarks, which was the work of Paschasius Quesnel, the Oratorian, in whose Congregation Jansenism had for a long time made great inroads.³ Le Tellier, who had in vain sought to blacken the Fathers of the Oratory at Court,⁴ now attempted to smite them and the cause of Jansenism by procuring a new papal condemnation of Quesnel's book. The reply of Rome was the famous Bull *Unigenitus*,⁵ which condemned one hundred and one propositions of Quesnel's New Testament (1713).

It was amidst opposition from the circle nearest to the Pope that this Bull was composed, and, as informants at Rome expressed it, it was "not published without terrible resistance." Clement XI. is said to have used the disputed book for his own edification. He was now obliged to consent to its condemnation *pour faire plaisir au Roi*, as the Jesuit Daubenton wrote to

¹ Fénelon: *Œuvres* (Toulouse 1811) XV, 596.

² *Correspondance de Fénelon* III, 244.

³ P. Allemand: *Hist. de l'éducation dans l'ancien Oratoire de France* (Paris 1889), 140f.

⁴ See his memorandum printed in L. Séché: *Les derniers Jansénistes* (Paris 1891) I, 17-32.

⁵ C. Schill: *Die Constitution Unigenitus, ihre Veranlassung und ihre Folgen* (Freiburg 1876). The author holds unreservedly the ultramontane point of view.

Fénelon.¹ At an episcopal synod which the Archbishop of Paris, Cardinal de Noailles, held in January 1714, out of forty-nine bishops assembled there were no fewer than nine, among them Cardinal de Noailles himself, who desired an explanation from the Pope, before submitting to the Bull.² But Louis XIV. would not allow this minority to apply to Rome. Cardinal de Noailles was banished from the Court, and the other opponents were "exiled" to their sees. Thereupon the Bull was registered by the Parliament of Paris, with the usual reservation—provided that it did not conflict with the rights of the Crown and the liberties of the Gallican Church.

So far had Jesuitism succeeded in the battle with Gallicanism and Jansenism when Louis XIV. died. The opposition which the Bull *Unigenitus* aroused all over France had made a strong impression upon the aged King. The Duchess of Orleans comes very near to saying that the commotion caused by "that accursed Constitution," which would not allow Louis XIV. to have any rest night or day, had shortened his life.³

The new government adopted a new ecclesiastical policy. Philip, Duke of Orleans, who assumed the Regency, immediately gave the imprisoned Jansenists their liberty, and Cardinal de Noailles was taken again into favour. Le Tellier, on the other hand, was obliged to forsake the country. There was even for an instant some talk of suppressing the Jesuits and calling the Protestants back; but the Duke was satisfied with banishing the disciples of Loyola from the confessional and the pulpit, and with modifying the severity of the laws against the Protestants.⁴

These measures aroused the greatest alarm in the camp of the Jesuits, and bright hopes among the Jansenists. The church question, which even under Louis XIV. had been discussed with lively interest in lay circles, now divided all Frenchmen into two groups, which in some places even adopted an external badge to distinguish themselves from each other. Those who sympathised with the Jansenists wore a red, white, and yellow ribbon, while the *Unigenitus* party wore red and

¹ *Correspondance de Fénelon* IV, 371.

² Reusch : *Index* II, 734f.

³ *Correspondance complète de Madame, Duchesse d'Orléans, née Princesse palatine, mère du Régent*, par M. G. Brunet (Paris 1855) II, 169.

⁴ F. Rocquain : *L'esprit révolutionnaire avant la révolution* (Paris 1878), 7f.

black. Four of the French bishops went so far as to appeal to an Universal Council, and a daring Frenchman posted up their appeal upon the wall of St Peter's under the very eyes of the Pope. All France came gradually to be divided into two parties, the Acceptants, and the Recusants or Appellants. To the first, according to the saying of Voltaire, belonged a hundred bishops, the Jesuits, and the Capucins; to the second, fifteen bishops and—the whole nation.¹ In this division the original question, whether the hundred and one propositions were or were not heretical, fell into the background behind the question whether a papal Bull on matters of dogma was infallible.

In order to still the tumultuous waves, the Duke-Regent turned to Rome; and he forbade the publication of books or pamphlets on the burning question so long as his negotiations with the Pope were on foot. This order only awoke indignation on both sides, and Philip of Orleans in his perplexity determined to talk to the Duke of Saint-Simon on the subject.² The conversation, which took place in the Regent's box at the Opera, lasted during the whole performance; and it opened views which the unprincipled Duke-Regent had not before suspected. Saint-Simon made him understand the significance of the contest by setting it clearly before him that the most virtuous and learned prelates, and all the educated part of the nation, stood on the side of the Appellants, and that the victory of the *Unigenitus* party would in fact mean that Rome had gained the same power over France as it had already gained over Portugal, Spain, and Italy. Accordingly the all-important thing to do, Saint-Simon said, was to intimidate the papal nuncio in Paris, to show a firm front to the Pope, and "to teach the Jesuits in Paris and Rome to talk French."

But the Duke-Regent did not follow Saint-Simon's able advice. Probably he had been frightened by Dubois, who was already striving to gain the cardinal's purple, for which purpose it was above all things necessary to preserve good relations between Rome and Versailles. To impress the weak Regent more thoroughly, Clement XI. published a violent Pastoral, which under threat of excommunication demanded complete and instantaneous obedience to the *Unigenitus*. Against this

¹ Voltaire : *Le Siècle de Louis XIV.* (London 1788) III, 362.

² Saint-Simon : *Mémoires*, par Chéruel et Regnier (Paris 1873) XIII, 346f.

demand all the French Parliaments protested, pointing out that the Pope's Pastoral presupposed the doctrine of infallibility, which France had for centuries withstood. Now also the Sorbonne and the University of Paris, which had hitherto in a dignified manner held back, ranged themselves on the side of the Parliaments, and Cardinal de Noailles caused his appeal to be posted up on all the church doors in the capital.

The discovery of a plot whose aim was to transfer the Regency to the King of Spain, in which it was supposed that the hand of the Jesuits could be traced, had the effect of making Philip of Orleans think it wisest to fall in as far as possible with the Society of Jesus and with Rome; and various papers and pastorals, which were condemned by the Parliament of Paris to the fire, showed that the *Unigenitus* party had by no means given up the hope of victory. In one pamphlet, the opinion that Councils are superior to the Pope was represented as a new dogma, contrary to tradition; in another, it was said that to deny the Pope's infallibility was as heretical as to deny the Divinity of Christ. The Archbishop of Reims, in a letter to the Acceptants, accused the opponents of the Bull—the Appellants—of going astray in the paths of Luther, Arius, Nestorius, and Eutyches; and he counselled his party to refuse the Regent any subsidies from the Church, if he did not wholly and entirely adopt the *Unigenitus*. On the other side, in a Jansenist pamphlet, an Universal Council was compared with the Estates of the Realm, which “enjoy all the rights of sovereignty when they are assembled.” Although this writing also was condemned by the Parliament as an attack upon the royal authority,¹ it revealed what political ideas were growing up under cover of Gallicanism and Jansenism, just as the advice of the Archbishop of Reims to the Acceptants showed that there was a section of the higher clergy who were not disinclined to place regard for the Church above regard for the country.

It was at this time that the financial projects of John Law began to arrest the attention of all Frenchmen, and Jansenism now retired for a while into the shade, in favour of the discussion about the gold from the Mississippi, as at one time it had been driven into the background by the strife over the *régale* and

¹ Rocquain, 17f.

Gallicanism. But the Duke-Regent, who was surrounded by Jesuits, did not lose sight of the recognition of the *Unigenitus*; and when the peace between France and Spain was sealed by a proposal for a double marriage between the princely houses, it was taken for granted that the Regent would protect the Jesuits, and would give effect to the disputed Bull in that country where the Spanish Infanta was to be educated in view of becoming one day Queen. In reward for his activity on this occasion, the Jesuit Daubenton gained in addition two favourable concessions for his order: a Jesuit was nominated as confessor to the French King, and the Chancellor d'Aguesseau, a bitter enemy of the Society of Jesus, was dismissed.¹ But the resistance of the Appellants to the *Unigenitus* was not broken, and it became clear that Saint-Simon had spoken the truth in his description of the two parties. The cause of Jansenism was followed with sympathy by the largest and the best part of the nation, and many Jansenists showed in the hour of danger a courage which took men's thoughts back to the intrepidity of the first Christians under the persecutions of the Roman Empire.

The Duke-Regent, however, cast in his lot more and more distinctly with the Jesuits. High offices of State were given to their friends, and after the death of Claude Fleury, the Gallican church historian, a Jesuit, as had been agreed at the time of the peace with Spain, was assigned to Louis XV. for his confessor. This confessor painted the Jansenists in such black colours, that the young King came to consider a Jansenist as a worse being than an atheist.² The ancient rights of the Parliaments were recklessly trodden under foot, and their complaints were not listened to. A *chambre du Pape* was erected in Paris, to which was given the duty of prosecuting all writings directed against the papal see and the Bull *Unigenitus*. The harsh ancient laws of censorship were collected, and if they had been enforced, the liberty of the Press would have been completely annihilated in France. Thus the Regency which began with being so liberal minded, ended with adopting the ways of Louis XIV. Mathieu Marais might with good reason write in his memoirs (1723), "Rome rules over us more than ever it did ;

¹ *Correspondance de Madame, Duchesse d'Orléans* II, 361.

² *Ibid.*, 368.

our liberties disappear, and we are falling into infallibility.”¹ The desire for the cardinal’s hat, as the Duchess of Orleans says, had “made most of the bishops mad.”² All France was scandalised when Dubois, an openly immoral and irreligious man, who had long before obtained Fénelon’s see of Cambrai, received as a reward for his activity on behalf of the *Unigenitus* the cardinal’s purple. But when the unprincipled prelate in 1722 had been chosen First Minister by the Regent, the French bishops forgot the scandal to such an extent that in 1723 they unanimously chose him President of their quinquennial assembly. Shortly after, however, both the old clerical libertine, and the Duke Regent, died.

Cardinal Dubois’ successor, no less unworthy, and in ecclesiastical questions no less ignorant than he, the Duke of Condé-Bourbon, gave himself also over to the guidance of the Jesuits. The Infanta of Spain, indeed, was sent home without the accomplishment of the marriage between her and Louis XV., which had been agreed upon at the conclusion of the peace with Spain; but Maria Leczinska, who became Queen of France, was quite as much in the Jesuits’ leading strings. The people of Paris called her *Unigenita*, and sang a ballad which ended thus:—

“Et ton règne s’affermira,
Cher *Unigenitus*, par *Unigenita*.”

Under the new government, in spite of the protest of Sweden and Holland, the ancient laws against the Protestants were again put in full force. All other divine service, except that of the Roman Church, was forbidden; all Protestant ministers were to be punished with death; all Protestant laymen with lifelong imprisonment and loss of their property. And the doctrine of the Pope’s infallibility, which hitherto had only ventured shyly and timidly forth, was now expanded and exhibited at full length in a book printed in Holland, the work of a Benedictine author, as an expression of the doctrine of all countries and of every age.³ It was of little use that the Parliament of Paris suppressed the book; the doctrine of infallibility was now supported in every way by the supreme authority.

¹ Rocquain, 32.

² *Correspondance* II, 165.

³ Rocquain, 36f.

The Bishop of Fréjus, Cardinal André Fleury, who in 1726 at the age of seventy years succeeded the Duke of Bourbon as First Minister, had already for some while taken the lead in church matters, and had shown himself a determined opponent of the Jansenists.¹ Once upon a time he had himself been a thorough-going Jansenist, but in the course of time he had become more ultramontane than the Pope, and accordingly under his government Jesuitism gained one victory after another. The aged Cardinal de Noailles, who for so long a time had boldly refused to subscribe the *Unigenitus* without reservation, was now obliged to make known his acceptance of the Bull, and his successor in the archiepiscopal see of Paris persecuted with great zeal all those priests in his diocese who were tainted with Jansenism. In 1730 Fleury even succeeded in getting the hated Constitution registered in the Sorbonne, but only after depriving forty-eight of the doctors of the Sorbonne of their right to vote. In the same year the Cardinal caused Louis XV., by means of a *lit de justice*, to compel the Parliament also to register an order that the clergy of the whole kingdom should submit to the *Unigenitus* without any manner of reservation, and thereupon the University finally gave up its opposition. In this case also obedience was only extorted by an act of violence. No fewer than eighty-two members protested when the University determined to strike the appeal against the *Unigenitus* off its register; but these protesting doctors were punished by the loss of their degrees, so that the renowned University on this occasion lost many powerful teachers.²

After the subjection of Cardinal de Noailles, the Sorbonne, and the University, Jesuitism had to all appearance completely won the victory in France. But many of those who submitted to the *Unigenitus*, out of a sense of duty to the Pope, still differed in other respects from the Society of Jesus. Massillon, who died Bishop of Clermont, upbraided the Jansenists, it is true, with having led women and simple lay folk to express opinions on the deepest mysteries, and with having made those mysteries the subjects of dispute. "This," he said, "has spread irreligion, because for lay people the distance is not great between

¹ See in particular the *Mémoires du duc de Luynes* (Paris 1861) V, 237f.

² Rocquain, 97.

disputation and doubt, and between doubt and unbelief.”¹ But all the same Massillon would not make common cause with the order of Loyola in everything. “The Jesuits,” he writes to another French bishop,² “have their opinions, which the Church tolerates; but do you really believe that the majority of the bishops think and teach as they do? I can assure you that the opposite is the case.”

Massillon was certainly right. Cornelius Jansen, Arnould, and Pascal had not lived in vain; and in the crowd of prelates who mustered round the banner of the *Unigenitus* there were many who only followed the standard with divided hearts, and with much reservation. But new demands were constantly being made from Rome which confirmed the Jesuits in their assurance of victory. Benedict XIII., who had been Pope since 1724, in 1726 canonised the Jesuit Aloysius of Gonzaga, and in him the order of Loyola found its favourite saint. Little by little, the legend of St Aloysius was embellished with accounts of the strangest apocryphal miracles,³ and already under the following Pope six Aloysius-Sundays, as they were called, had a plenary indulgence accorded to them. Benedict XIII. was eager also to make the day of Gregory VII. (25th May) a festival for the whole Roman Church, and he wished to introduce everywhere into the breviaries a lesson⁴ praising the great Pope for having excommunicated Henry IV., taken his kingdom from him, and absolved his subjects from their allegiance. The Parliament of Paris, however, opposed the introduction of this addition, and there were other places also where the same was prohibited.⁵

As Ultramontanism and Jesuitism became more daring, Gallicanism and Jansenism proceeded to greater extremes. In Gallican circles people began seriously to discuss the separation of Church and State; and on the same day that the Parliament

¹ Sicard : *L'ancien clergé de France* I, 376 note.

² Soanen, Bishop of Senes. The letter is found in Blampignon : *L'épiscopat de Massillon, suivi de sa correspondance* (Paris 1884), 263f.

³ Reusch : *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Jesuitenordens*, 201f., and *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, 1894, 279f.

⁴ Lectio V. in the section for 25th May.

⁵ Reusch : *Index* II, 788f. Modern Ultramontanism regards this encomium upon Gregory VII. as “harmless language.” Schill : *Die Constitution Unigenitus*, 252, note.

of Paris refused the above-named addition to the Breviary, it found it necessary at the same time to express condemnation of a Jansenist work, the author of which had affirmed in the name of the faithful laity that there were cases in which the shepherd ought to obey the sheep, and that the people should be judges when the bishops fell into error.¹ The Jansenist-minded Bishop of Montpellier, about the same date, spoke in a pastoral letter of an approaching revolution, which, in his opinion, would cause the formation of a new Church, to take the place of the existing Church, which had been so misled and degraded.² And amidst the strong provocation of the moment expressions were used which showed that many of the thoughts of the Revolution were sprouting up under the shelter of Gallicanism and Jansenism. "The people," it was said, "is above the King, as the Universal Church is above the Pope," and words of the kind were echoed far and wide. In this way the Bishop of Montauban,³ a partisan of the Jesuits, in 1753 dared in his pastoral letter to hint that the Parliament of Paris might perhaps be in a position to emulate the English Parliament, and to bring the King of France to the scaffold.⁴

By degrees Jansenism had abandoned the quiet obedience which distinguished it in the days of Louis XIV., and had now developed into a strong domestic opposition, which was an increasingly political force. At the outset, the Jansenists had set their hopes upon the young King; but when it became apparent that in all church questions he was dependent upon the Jesuits, and in moral respects was no better than the Regency men, they turned with repugnance from the Court. And at Court they began to be differently regarded. Up till now the disciples of Cornelius Jansen had been considered *une secte fastueuse*; after 1750 they were esteemed at Court to be republicans.

And however great may be the sympathy entertained for Jansenism, promoted as it had been by many luminous intelligences and noble hearts, it ought not to be forgotten that the Jansenist controversy, so bitterly carried on, had momentous consequences for the French Church. In a high

¹ Rocquain, 54.

² *Ibid.*, 73.

³ *Journal et Mémoires du Marquis d'Argenson* (Paris 1866) VIII, 153.

⁴ Rocquain, 175.

degree it weakened the power of resistance to the anti-ecclesiastical and anti-christian spirit, which in the course of the eighteenth century worked its way more and more into prominence, and the eager battle against the Bull *Unigenitus* drove many hesitating Gallican prelates over into the arms of Rome. From defending a papal Bull, not a few passed on to defending the Pope's infallibility, which was the pith and marrow of the whole contention.

CHAPTER II

L'ESPRIT PHILOSOPHIQUE AND JESUITISM

BEHIND the Jansenist opposition, which originally spoke in the name of faith and spirituality, and which, though it was not influenced by English Puritanism, nevertheless recalled many features of the same, it was possible even before the middle of the century to observe an opposition of a philosophical nature. It had been schooled by the English Deists, and by the statesmen and thinkers of England, and it turned in the name of outraged reason against both Rome and Versailles with greater energy than Jansenism had shown, and with clear consciousness of a far more profound divergence. Hatred of Jesuitism, contempt for the many prelates who were unworthy of their position, the short-sighted fanaticism which at last desired to exclude all opponents of the Bull *Unigenitus* from the means of grace, and even from church burial; the disagreeable scenes of convulsion and alleged miracles at the grave of the Jansenist Abbé Paris in the churchyard of St Médard—all this contributed to stimulate the rising criticism of the Church and of its doctrine. The century was not half run out, before both Ultramontane and Jansenist were speaking of *le siècle irreligieux*; and this century which had begun with theology ended in atheism and materialism.

The *esprit philosophique* of the eighteenth century can trace its pedigree up to Rabelais and his Pantagruel philosophy, which stood in near relation to the Humanism of Erasmus and the Renaissance.

Through Montaigne and Charron, through De la Mothe le Vayer, Gassend, Huet, and Bayle, scepticism and criticism were kept alive among many Frenchmen, so that there were signs early in the eighteenth century of a widespread freedom

of thought. The Duchess of Orleans wrote as early as 1722 : "I do not believe that there are a hundred persons in Paris, either amongst the ministers of the Church or amongst men of the world, who hold the true Christian faith, or who even believe in our Saviour."¹ These words certainly contain much exaggeration, but it is a fact that free thought, in spite of Arnauld and Pascal, and the great French preachers, had gained a powerful hold. And while the Jansenists and the Parliamentary Gallicans were carrying on their brave fight against papal infallibility and royal autocracy, Montesquieu and Voltaire were making in England preliminary studies for those works which were to carry the *esprit philosophique* far beyond the circle of the so-called *gens des lettres*. But not till after the middle of the century did the pursuit of philosophy become a power in the French commonwealth.²

Montesquieu's *Lettres Persanes*, which appeared in 1721, is commonly considered as the first swallow which heralded the philosophic spring. In those famous letters the author allows his wit to play at the expense of "the ancient idol before which people are accustomed to strew incense"; of "the magician who makes the King believe that Three are only One, and that bread which is eaten is not bread, and wine which is drunk is not wine." They contain attacks upon the celibacy of the clergy, and the life of the convent, upon the confessional and the Inquisition, and biting mockery over the account of the Fall and of Christ's miraculous birth. All the polemic of Voltaire lies already stored in this bold book, which treats the Church and its activities with superior irony, and the monks with the greatest contempt. It came out anonymously; and, although it was printed at Rouen, for the sake of security it bore the name of Amsterdam upon the title-page. It had the good fortune to pass the censor of the Press, and within the course of a very short time it appeared in four editions and four after-impressions.³ Not so lucky, thirteen years later, were the *Lettres Philosophiques* of Voltaire, although this book also, because of the censorship of the Press, bore Amsterdam instead of Rouen as its printing-

¹ *Correspondance de Madame, Duchesse d'Orléans* II, 369.

² Ch. Aubertin : *L'esprit public au XVIII. siècle* (Paris 1873), 270.

³ A. Sorel : *Montesquieu* (Paris 1889), 39.

place. The Parliament of Paris condemned the philosophical letters to be burned, as injurious to religion and the commonwealth, and the author, in order to escape the Bastille, was obliged to seek shelter in the Château of Cirey, with his friend the Marquise de Chatelet. Later on, Voltaire once more aroused the wrath of Cardinal Fleury by the copies of *La Pucelle* which passed from hand to hand; but in 1739, when the Cardinal at the age of eighty-six was hoping to be the successor of Pope Clement XII., he approached the witty writer to secure his pen in that war to the death against Jansenism, which was to open for himself the way to the chair of St Peter. Voltaire then received a commission to write certain letters against Jansenism, which might form a counterpart to Pascal's famous *Provincial Letters* against Jesuitism; and he undertook the work. But before he had got very far with it, to Cardinal Fleury's exasperation, he threw his manuscript into the fire.

Shortly after, Fleury died without seeing his dream of the tiara fulfilled, and under the direction of the Marquis d'Argenson a great change took place in the attitude of the government towards philosophy. D'Argenson, who had sat beside Voltaire on the benches of the Jesuit Collège Louis-le-Grand, was equally removed from Jansenism and from Jesuitism; but the latter was a power which he was obliged, as a statesman, to reckon with. His private religion was like the Deism which lay behind Voltaire's religious polemic. In 1754 he wrote in his diary: "We are assured that everything in France is preparing for a great religious reformation, which will be something very different from that coarse Reformation, that mixture of superstition and free thought, which in the sixteenth century came to us from Germany. Both have overtaken us in consequence of the encroachments of tyranny and the covetousness of the priests; but as our people and our century are very differently instructed from those of Luther, things will go as far as they ought to go; all priests, all revelation, all mysteries, will be put under the ban; and men will from henceforth only see God in His great beneficent works."¹ Starting from this conception of the circumstances of his time, D'Argenson laboured earnestly

¹ *Journal et Mémoires du Marquis d'Argenson* VIII, 281f.

for *tolérantisme*, and for a few years the French philosophers were able to set forth their views without danger, so long as they could escape offending the Jesuitism which still steadily prevailed at Court.

Voltaire was one of those who made good use of the tolerance now begun, and he understood better than most how to flatter the Pope and the Jesuits. The learned and vivacious Bolognese, Prosper Lambertini, who, as Benedict XIV., won the tiara when Cardinal Fleury coveted it, accepted the dedication of Voltaire's drama of *Mahomet*, in which the Arabian prophet, amidst frequent sallies against fanaticism, is depicted as a coarse impostor, and as a Tartuffe with sword in hand. In 1742 the production of *Mahomet* was still prohibited at Paris, but the Pope sent the author a mirthful and most gracious letter of thanks for the dedication. Voltaire had also the pleasure of seeing two of his dramatic works produced at Versailles in 1745, at the wedding of the Dauphin. He became royal historiographer, and obtained the permission of Louis XV. to seek admission into the Academy.

To obtain this long desired honour, he was obliged to court the good-will of the Jesuits; and he found no difficulty in doing so. A Jansenist church newspaper had spoken of Benedict XIV.'s friendly communication to the French poet, and had upbraided the latter with his affection for the Jesuits. This gave Voltaire the opportunity of making a public declaration of his love for Jesuitism, which was at the same time a declaration of submission to the Church. He sent a letter to Père de la Tour, the principal of the Collège Louis-le-Grand, in which he assured him that he had never seen anything but what was fair and good—diligence, moderation, and order—in his old school, and that he could not conceive how people had come to ascribe bad morals to the Society of Jesus. He thought it possible that some points which were assailed in the moral system of the Jesuits were nothing but base falsifications on the part of opponents; his own *Henriade* had not been printed correctly. "Probably," he says in this connexion, "no correct edition of my works will be obtainable till after my death." Like the great Corneille, he was willing to allow the Church to be the judge of all his writings. "If at any time," he wrote, "a single page has been printed in my name

which could offend even one minister of the Church, I am willing to tear it in pieces in his presence. I wish to live peaceably, and to die in the bosom of the Roman Catholic Apostolic Church, without attacking anyone, without injuring anyone, without having one thought that could offend anyone whatever."¹

This hypocritical letter, which gained access for Voltaire to the French Academy, shows better than anything else what power Jesuitism still had at Paris in 1746. A couple of months after Voltaire had in this humiliating fashion attempted to win the favour of the Jesuits, the Parliament condemned to the bonfire La Mettrie's *Histoire Naturelle de l'Ame*, in which all difference between spirit and matter was denied. The same punishment at the same time befell Diderot's first work, his *Pensées Philosophiques*, in which he entirely rejected positive Christianity. This was the beginning of a combat on the part of the Parliament of Paris against the materialism which was now raising its head. Many of the Frenchmen who affected philosophy had forsaken Descartes, and attached themselves to Condillac and his doctrine that sense was the only source of ideas; and very many passed by degrees from sensualism to pure materialism. In works like Toussaint's *Des Mœurs*, Helvetius' *De l'Esprit* and *De l'Homme*, and Baron Holbach's *Système de la Nature*, materialism came more and more unhesitatingly forward as a denial of God's Being and Providence, of freedom, and of the difference between good and evil, of the existence of the soul, and of everlasting life.

At the same time that French thought was thus breaking more and more with Cartesianism, Bossuet's highly admired *Politique tirée de l'Ecriture Sainte* was thrown into the shade by Montesquieu's *L'Esprit des Lois*. In spite of his *Lettres Persanes*, Montesquieu had been exceedingly well received by the Pope when he visited Rome in 1728. Benedict XIII. went so far as to give the distinguished Frenchman, when he took his leave, a dispensation from fasting without being asked. The next day a messenger from the Curia brought Montesquieu the dispensation in writing, in order (amongst other things) to obtain the customary fee; but Montesquieu dismissed the

¹ *Œuvres de Voltaire* (Paris 1831) LV, 83f.

messenger with the remark that Benedict XIII. was a man of honour, whom he could trust upon his word alone. When the *Esprit des Lois* came out in 1748, there was great excitement in ecclesiastical circles at the French capital. It was thought that this book *ne ménage pas assez la religion*; but the Jesuit and Jansenist critics in vain endeavoured to stop its dissemination. Even at Rome, in the immediate entourage of the Pope, Montesquieu had friends and patrons. In less than two years his book went through twenty-one editions, and was translated into all languages. When at last, in 1752, Rome put it upon the index of prohibited books, its reputation was so well established that no one regarded the papal prohibition—which indeed has attracted so little observation that as late as 1857 Villemain denied its existence.¹

In the second half of the century came one after another the successive volumes of the great *Encyclopædia*, which gives as trustworthy a picture of the doubt and unbelief of the eighteenth century as Thomas Aquinas' *Summa Theologiæ* gives of the faith and superstition of the thirteenth. Those who laboured together upon the *Encyclopædia* showed a clever reticence in those articles where it might be expected that ecclesiastically minded readers would especially look for something to take offence at. Voltaire was alarmed when he saw that the articles on metaphysical and theological subjects were so orthodox that they might have stood in a church *Encyclopædia*. D'Alembert, however, comforted him by saying that there were other less conspicuous articles in which the damage was made good; and Diderot in view of Voltaire's apprehensions expressed the assurance that time would teach men to make a difference between what the author had written and what he had thought.² This distinction both the Church and the government quickly learned to make. The Archbishop of Paris, De Beaumont, immediately complained that daring writers, as if by agreement, were using their talents and their industry to concoct poison, "and perhaps their success," he said, "has exceeded their expectations."³ Jesuit and Jansenist vied

¹ A. Sorel: *Montesquieu*, 1387. Reusch: *Index* II, 869f. *Index librorum prohibitorum* (Romæ 1881), 110.

² J. Bertrand: *D'Alembert* (Paris 1889), 62f. J. Reinach: *Diderot* (Paris 1894), 59.

³ Rocquain, 150.

with one another to induce the state authorities to intervene, and this time their endeavours were successful. As soon as the second volume of the *Encyclopædia* was issued, both the parts which had appeared were confiscated, and this "engine of war for the de-christianisation of France"¹ was thereby, to outward appearance, rendered harmless for French Christians.

But the scoffing criticism of the Encyclopædists, in spite of all prohibitions of their work, penetrated further and further into French society. That philosophy, which sprang from the gilded and silk-upholstered chairs in the *salons*, was at first accounted to belong only to "good society," and it despised the people, which to most of the philosophers, as to Voltaire, was *la canaille*. But little by little the aristocratic philosophy trickled down to the *bourgeois*, and so became an important power in the French commonwealth. Contempt for religion and morality; the abstract conception of Man and of the People (which was little in accordance with reality); the utter want of historical sense; the superstitious belief in the importance of philosophy for the life of men and for the commonwealth—all this prepared the ground, so that it came to bear fearful and bloody fruit for the whole French nation. And a political criticism grew up side by side with the philosophical criticism. Its progress was stimulated by the unfortunate Peace of Aachen, by the heavy taxes, by a terrible famine, and by Louis XV.'s excesses and prodigality. A deluge of ballads and satirical pictures fostered contempt for the King, and hatred for royalty; and many of them, which were directly aimed at the monarchy, included the Church also in their displeasure, because the altar was a support to the throne.

In the very midst of these threatening conditions, Jesuitism, confident of victory—the Jesuitism which could bring even a Voltaire, as it appeared, to his knees—ventured to begin a new war of extermination against its old foe Jansenism. In accordance with the orders of Archbishop de Beaumont—due, no doubt, to the instigation of the Jesuits—the priests in Paris who belonged to that party refused the sacraments to the dying if they could not furnish proof that they had confessed to priests who had submitted to the Bull *Unigenitus*; and many unpleasant scenes took place at death-beds. The Parliament of

¹ E. Joyau: *La Philosophie en France pendant la Révolution* (Paris 1893), 44.

Paris stepped in against the Archbishop and those priests in the capital who complied with his command, and the action caused so great a rejoicing that the government found it necessary to order silence with regard to the *Unigenitus*. But the order was not obeyed, and the King did not know what to do. When he talked with Madame de Pompadour, who at that time was influenced by Choiseul, he thought the Parliament was in the right; but when he had conferred with his Prime Minister, Tencin, who was the tool of the Jesuits, he thought that the Archbishop was right. Heartily tired¹ of the complaints and prohibitions of the Parliament, he sent the members of it to Pontoise; but it brought him no rest. One after another the friends of Parliament forsook Paris, and the priests of the capital complained that the number of communicants was steadily going down. D'Argenson, whose *Memoirs* make it possible for us to follow almost day by day the conflict between Parliament and the bishops, writes: "You cannot blame the English philosophy, which in Paris has only been accepted by some hundred philosophers, for the harm which has been done to religion in France. It is due to hatred of the priests, which now passes all bounds. The ministers of religion can scarcely show themselves in the streets without a hue and cry after them; and all this arises from the Bull *Unigenitus* and the disgrace of Parliament."² In every direction sympathy for the Parliament was openly displayed; and even the provincial Parliaments forgot their old jealousy of the Parliament of the capital, and ranged themselves upon its side.

Yet the Jesuits did not despair. They got the King to banish the members of the Parliament of Paris to Soissons without giving them anything to do, and to decree that a "Royal Chamber" should take the place of Parliament; and as soon as this was accomplished, they advanced with even greater boldness. Their adherents throughout France refused the sacraments to the opponents of the Bull *Unigenitus*, and in the Holy Week of 1754 a Jesuit preacher admonished Louis XV. that heresies always have to be extinguished in blood, and that it would be best to shed a few drops in time, in order to avoid a

¹ "Sa Majesté dit que les affaires du parlement l'ennuient plus qu'elles ne la chagrinent." D'Argenson VIII, 26.

² D'Argenson VIII, 35 (19th May 1753).

whole flood afterwards. To D'Argenson it looked as if all were moving towards a great religious and political revolution. It was no longer Jansenists and Jesuits who stood opposed to each other; it was a national party and a church party—Frenchmen, and the partisans of the Inquisition and of superstition.¹

The revolution, however, which threatened to break out in 1754, was fortunately averted by the King's dissolving the "Royal Chamber," calling the members of the Parliament back, and banishing the Archbishop and two other episcopal firebrands to Conflans. In his distress De Beaumont wrote to Madame de Pompadour to implore her good offices; but from that quarter he got no consolation. "I wish," answered the Marquise, "that certain prelates, instead of considering themselves Church Fathers and issuing pastorals which Parliament burns and the nation despises, would give us an example of self-control, moderation, and love of peace. Bills of confession are certainly a remarkable institution, but charity is better still."² In this letter can already be discerned the storm which was rising against the Jesuits in France. "Your Jesuits," the Marquise writes again, "ought to be left to the justice of the Parliaments. A man who knows them well said to me yesterday that the only good thing they had ever done was to furnish us with quinine from Peru. But they have been a scourge to those kings and states which have tolerated them. It is not possible for me to do the Jesuits any service; but even if I could, I would not; I tell it you straight out. My opinion is that they deserve to be abolished. Now abolish them!" The letter has the following characteristic ending: "I have this moment received a great budget of letters. They are from bishops who beg me to use my influence in favour of the Society. By this I see that almost the whole clergy of the country has formed a league to save the Society, while almost all the lay people are united to destroy it—and with good reason. I shall beg those bishops also to let me have peace and to give me their episcopal blessing."

When such was the feeling at Court, it was not wonderful that the Parliament became bolder. Paris rejoiced again when

¹ D'Argenson VIII, 278f., 242, 313.

² *Lettres de Madame la Marquise de Pompadour, depuis 1753 à 1762 inclusivement* (Londres 1772), 126f.

the Parliament forbade the ministers of the Church, whatever might be their rank—the bishops were thus included—to give the Bull *Unigenitus* the authority of a rule of faith. Thereby the importance of the detested Bull for France was for the time destroyed;¹ but the opponents of the Jesuits were still not propitiated. The priests were so hated, says D'Argenson, that it was at the risk of their lives that they went through the streets in their long clothes; and in good society people no longer dared to say a word in defence of the priests or of the *Unigenitus*.² The clergy of the Jesuit party talked already of a persecution like that of Diocletian; but there were signs that they would not behave themselves so quietly as the ancient Christians did in the days of Diocletian. D'Argenson was told that in the Bastille there was a priestly fanatic on behalf of the *Unigenitus*, who was accused and convicted of an attempt upon the King's life; and there were other priests who went so far as to hint that there were still Ravallacs to be found.³ In these circumstances it made no impression upon the King when the bishops informed him that they should feel themselves tempted to the uttermost if he would not interfere against the Parliament.⁴ Louis XV., on the contrary, gave permission for the *Encyclopædia* to appear again; Protestants in many places obtained leave to build churches, and there was some talk of putting the Edict of Nantes in legal force once more. At the carnival of 1756 there were so many caricatures of bishops, abbés, monks, and nuns, that D'Argenson said it looked as if the French were falling away to the doctrines of Luther and of Calvin.⁵

The strenuous labours of the Jesuits, however, succeeded in disturbing the good relations between the King and the Parliaments. The supreme tribunal of France, *le Grand Conseil*, at the instigation of the Jesuits, applied to Louis XV., requesting him to put a stop to the resistance offered to the *Unigenitus*; and in court circles plans were discussed for giving to the *Grand Conseil* the place of the Parliament of Paris; by which means Ultramontanism would have won the game.⁶ Madame de

¹ "Voilà la constitution anéantie nationalement," wrote D'Argenson (19th March 1755) VIII, 452.

² *Ibid.*, 453.

³ *Ibid.*, IX, 18.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 63.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 216.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 256f.

Pompadour, who at an earlier time had broken with the bishops in order to side with the Parliament, now threw herself into the arms of the Jesuits. By February 1756 the Marquise, who from thenceforth was to be only Louis XV.'s "friend," had taken the Jesuit De Sacy for her confessor; and she, who shortly before had felt highly flattered when Voltaire called her "one of ours,"¹ now after her change followed with the greatest zeal all her confessor's advice and commands.² The morals of the Court, however, were not improved. Louis XV. took two new mistresses; and according to D'Argenson the tone at Versailles was no purer than that of a common brothel.³ The courtiers followed Louis XV.'s example; and everywhere in the passages of the Court chamber-maids were met carrying letters of assignation. But this corrupt Court was in religious matters decidedly Jesuit. Madame de Pompadour became more and more the First Minister of France, and her efforts were directed towards binding the King to the order of Loyola, so that the Parisians thought that Louis XV. was more popish than Louis XIV. had ever been.⁴

At this time the humiliations and disappointments of the Seven Years' War filled the minds of all Frenchmen with grief and anger; but in spite of these misfortunes the Jesuit party kept up internal dissension by constant attacks upon the Parliament of Paris. The Bishop of Troyes ordered his priests to offer prayers for its conversion,⁵ and in a pastoral letter he declared at length that all the misfortunes of France were owing to the Parliament's lack of right devotion to the Blessed Virgin, and its unbelief in the Immaculate Conception.⁶ Parliament took action against these and similar utterances on the part of the episcopate, and it was proposed to throw the Bishop of Troyes into prison. Before this was done, Louis XV. once more became irresolute, and in his distress besought Benedict XIV. to find some means of appeasing the raging billows. The reply of Rome was a brief which insisted that the *Unigenitus* was a law of the Church, and must be obeyed if men did not wish to forfeit eternal happiness. In view of this brief the French priests might at their own risk (*à leurs risques et périls*) give the sacraments to

¹ J. Reinach : *Diderot*, 61.

² *Ibid.*, 170f.

³ *Ibid.*, 307.

⁴ D'Argenson, IX, 196f.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 356.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 359.

dying people who were only suspected of Jansenism ; but from henceforth they were to refuse them to open Jansenists.¹ When the Parliament of Paris desired to have this brief suppressed, Madame de Pompadour addressed the King thus : " Stand fast ; you have the Pope on your side." Whereupon Louis XV., in December 1756, after hearing Mass in the Sainte Chapelle and kissing the splinter of the True Cross, held a *lit de justice*, at which he ordered the acceptance of the Bull *Unigenitus* as a law of the Church, and made a decree with regard to the future position of Parliament which stripped it of any importance.²

This arbitrary proceeding on the part of the King aroused the greatest exasperation at Paris. It was whispered in corners that the time for resistance would soon come, and one of the members of Parliament, the Abbé Chauvelin, hinted that this *lit de justice* was "the last sigh of the expiring monarchy."³ The attempt of Damiens upon the life of Louis XV., which took place on 5th January 1757, threw men's minds into still stronger excitement. Both Jesuits and Jansenists were credited with the attempt, and Louis XV. profited by the occasion to publish a threat of death against all who ventured in print to attack religion or the royal authority, or to disturb the public peace.⁴ But as soon as quiet appeared to have returned, the feeble King abandoned his strong measures, and Parliament recovered its ancient position. At last, in the year 1757, commands were once more issued not to name the Bull *Unigenitus* in public writings, theses, or discussions ; but in order, at the same time, to show kindness to the episcopate the Archbishop of Paris received permission to return. When the Sorbonne, indignant at the King's vacillation and arbitrariness, offered a reminder that the renowned faculty had promised to defend the Roman Catholic religion *usque ad effusionem sanguinis*, the Dean was immediately banished a hundred miles from the capital, and the Archbishop, who was at the back of these proceedings of the Sorbonne, was sent to Périgord.

At the same time the Jesuits suffered another defeat. In the hope of better days they had caused the famous Moral

¹ Rocquain, 199.

² *Ibid.*, 368.

³ D'Argenson, IX, 356f.

⁴ Rocquain, 204.

System of their Westphalian brother, Hermann Busenbaum—the *Medulla Theologiæ Moralis*—to be printed, in an edition, moreover, which was in many points enlarged. The Parliament of Toulouse immediately ordered this book to be burnt by the hangman, because it appeared to contain propositions which were in conflict with divine and human laws, and might induce subjects to make attempts upon the sacred person of the King.¹ Busenbaum in fact taught the infallibility of the Pope, and the supremacy of the Papal Chair over secular princes, and in his utterances about certain cases in which manslaughter and theft were permissible, the Parliament of Toulouse, which was joined by the Parliament of Paris, found a pernicious morality. It was in vain that the heads of the Jesuit houses declared that they had always bowed to the Gallican Articles, that they abhorred the murder of kings, and disliked the propositions which were assailed. They were not believed. The Jansenist newspaper, *Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques*, expressed its astonishment that such men were still tolerated in France, and public opinion was so incensed against the Jesuits that no one dared to speak against the King's proceedings with regard to the Sorbonne and the Archbishop of Paris.

At this moment Pope Benedict XIV. died (3rd May 1758), and the Jesuits used every effort to secure the election of a new pope who was favourable to their order. The merry, witty Benedict XIV. had never been altogether a friend to Jesuitism. As Cardinal and Archbishop of Bologna, he had once cried to the renowned French Benedictine Montfaucon, "If there were rather less of Gallican liberties on your side, and fewer ultramontane demands on ours things would quickly right themselves."² As Pope he had been compelled by circumstances to maintain the *Unigenitus*, and personally he valued highly the General of the Jesuits, Visconti; but it sounded like an anticipation of what was to befall the order of Loyola, when he said to Visconti's successor, Centurioni, "It is an article of faith that *I* should have a successor; but no General of an order can say the same of himself."³ His closest friend in the College of Cardinals, Passionei, was an open enemy of the Jesuits.

¹ Reusch: *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Jesuitenordens*, 49f.

² Sicard: *L'ancien clergé de France* I, 426.

³ G. Phillips: *Vermischte Schriften* (Wien 1856) II, 155.

One day Benedict XIV., to tease Passionei, placed a copy of Busenbaum's Moral System in a conspicuous place in his library. As soon as the learned Cardinal spied the book, he flung it angrily out of the window. Passionei was not the only one of the high princes of the Church who nurtured a dislike for Jesuitism. Therefore it was of the utmost importance for the Jesuits to procure a successor to Benedict XIV. who would not give ear to the opponents of the order, and all the more because the deceased Pope had entrusted to their enemy, Cardinal Francisco de Saldanha, the office of investigating, as visitor and reformer, the operations of the Jesuits in Portugal and in the East and West Indies.

Portugal, which is seldom heard of in church history, had already begun under Benedict XIV. that conflict with the Jesuits, which led at last to the expulsion of the order from the country. At Lisbon the disciples of Loyola were not only, as almost everywhere in Europe, confessors to the royal family,¹ but also the advisers of the King and of the Ministers; and no great office in state or Church was filled without their opinion being heard.² The Portuguese Minister, Sebastian Carvalho, Count of Oeyras, afterwards Marquis of Pombal, like others, owed his elevation to the Jesuits. But he had long been secretly their opponent. Even whilst he was Ambassador of Portugal at Vienna he had been indignant at their religious and political power. When he became Portuguese Minister, his indignation grew to hatred, because his schemes of reform were opposed at every point by the members of the powerful order. The Society of Jesus was at that time a great commercial company, which, by its bold speculations and great command of money, threatened in certain regions of the New World to crush all other commercial enterprises; and the Jesuit state of Paraguay had long been a sore to the statesmen of Spain and Portugal alike. An exchange in South America between Spain and Portugal could not for many years be brought into operation, because the Indians, supported and led by the Jesuits in Paraguay offered an armed opposition to it.

¹ Cp. the recollections of the Jesuit Cordara in Döllinger's *Beiträge zur polit., kirchl. und Cultur-Gesch. der sechs letzten Jahrhunderte* (Wien 1882) III, 72.

² A. Theiner: *Geschichte des Pontificats Clemens' XIV.* (Leipzig 1853) I, 4f.

The fatal earthquake of Lisbon (1st November 1755), by which 30,000 people lost their lives, called forth the first collision between Pombal and the Jesuits. The Jesuits intimated that that appalling natural occurrence was Heaven's punishment for the sins of the Prime Minister and of the King; and they went out to the palace of Belem to warn King Joseph to do public penance.¹ When the Jesuits in Paraguay refused any longer to obey commands, Pombal determined to take revenge upon the refractory order. One September night, in 1757, the Jesuit confessors at Court were banished to their Novice House, and at the same time the members of the order were forbidden to show themselves at the palace without the express permission of the King. Next the Minister turned to Benedict XIV. complaining of the trickeries and covetousness of the Jesuits. He informed the Pope that a Portuguese Jesuit had said from the pulpit, in order to defend the monopoly of his order, that anyone who took a share in any rival commercial company would have no part in the fellowship of Jesus Christ; and Jesuits were said to have affirmed that wine bought of other dealers could not be used for the Holy Eucharist.

It was on the ground of these and similar accusations that Benedict XIV., a month before his death, had nominated Cardinal Saldanha as Apostolic Visitor. As soon as the Cardinal had obtained his powers from Rome, he published a decree which forbade the Jesuits to carry on trade after their usual manner to the infringement of divine and human law.² A little later, a second decree ordered them, till further notice, to desist from occupying the confessional and the pulpit in Portugal. In these circumstances it was of the utmost importance for the disciples of Loyola that a Pope should be chosen who would stop this visitation, which was very irksome to the order; while on the other side the opponents of Jesuitism did their utmost to promote the election of an enemy of the Jesuits. The Jansenists, who could reckon upon no small number of their own persuasion in the College of Cardinals, had immediately sent confidential agents to Rome to influence opinion; and the envoy of Portugal at Rome, Almada, had shortly after the

¹ H. Schäfer: *Geschichte von Portugal* (Gotha, 1854) V, 254f.

² Light has been thrown upon this decree from the Jesuits' side in B. Duhr's *Jesuitenfabeln* (Freiburg 1893), 275f.

publication of the papal brief to Saldanha requested his government to send some articles of value as presents to the two Cardinals Passionei and Archinto, who without doubt had been especially active in procuring that brief, and who might act in the interests of Portugal in the approaching Conclave.¹ As a counterpoise to these anti-Jesuit efforts, twenty-two cardinals, led by Gianfrancesco Albani, entered into a sworn agreement by which they pledged themselves not to choose an opponent of Jesuitism.² After long discussions the votes of the College of Cardinals appeared to gather round the Sardinian Cavalchini, who had voted for the canonisation of Bellarmine, and now apparently was the Jesuits' candidate; but when France employed its right of veto against him, the cardinals hastened to choose the Venetian Rezzonico, who was scarcely less acceptable to the Jesuit party, and after the lapse of eight months Rezzonico came out of the Conclave as Clement XIII.

The new Pope was a pious but very weak man, well suited to become a tool in the hands of the Jesuits.³ When people on every side praised his good-heartedness, Cardinal Passionei, who more than anyone else had the credit of wrecking the scheme for Bellarmine's canonisation, remarked: "Jesus Christ bore the same testimony to Nathaniel, but he did not make Nathaniel an Apostle."⁴

Soon after Clement XIII. had ascended the Chair of St Peter, the General of the Jesuits, Lorenzo Ricci, presented to him a petition with reference to the visitation in Portugal. In it Ricci declared that he had heard nothing whatsoever of the disorders which were said to have taken place in Portugal, and he proposed that the enquiry into the situation there should be conducted from Rome, affirming that if the opposite course were adopted, the visitation might easily lead to greater disturbances.⁵ Clement XIII. answered by recommending to the order three things—silence, patience, and

¹ Gomes: *Le Marquis de Pombal* (Lisbonne 1869), 157, after a letter from Almada in the Archives of the Portuguese Ministry of the Interior.

² Cordara 2of., cp. also Petruccelli della Gattina: *Histoire diplomatique des Conclaves* (Bruxelles 1866), IV, 141f.

³ *Ad extremum*, Cordara writes (p. 21), *terrefaciebat me ipsa natura bonitas et facilitas novi pontificis, quæ dos, ubi modum excedit, vitium est in principe.*

⁴ C. Justi: *Winckelmann* (Leipzig 1872) II, I, 224.

⁵ Schäfer V, 263.

prayers; the rest, he said, he would see to himself.¹ And thereupon he ordered his nuncio at Lisbon "in a friendly manner, and as if of his own motion" to let Saldanha know that people at Rome were displeased at his decrees, and especially at his attempt to bar the access of the Jesuits to the confessional and the pulpit.

Saldanha, however, had died a few weeks before Ricci had his audience of Clement XIII., and accordingly the visitation was for the time at a standstill. But in spite of the friendly attitude of the new Pope towards the order of Loyola, the dislike of it at Rome increased day by day. Almada obtained—it is not known by what means—a copy of Ricci's petition, and had it printed with the addition of certain remarks which renewed the old charges against the Jesuits. Out of regard for the Court of Lisbon, Clement XIII. dared not forbid the dissemination of this writing; and Almada ventured to publish a supplement, in which he described the Jesuits as rebels both against the Pope and against temporal rulers, accusing them of having taken the lives of more than twenty royal personages by means of poison and the dagger. From the archives of the Propaganda itself he succeeded in obtaining a document, which formed the basis of an attack on the hated order. On the gate of the Jesuit seminary were read the lines:

"L'Ispero e il Portoghese
V'aborre e vi discaccia.
Il Gallico paese
Spero che presto il faccia."

And a French Jansenist wrote home that he had the best hopes of the ruin of the order; that even if the Pope wished to protect it, his efforts in that direction would not be crowned with success.²

While in Rome the enemies of the Jesuits thus gained courage, the order fared badly in Portugal. The attempted assassination of King Joseph (3rd September 1758), not only gave Pombal an opportunity of taking vengeance on a few of those noble families, which stood in the way of his reforms and his personal wishes, but also had fatal consequences for

¹ Cordara, 22.

² *Ibid.*, 23f.

the Portuguese Jesuits.¹ In the night between the 11th and 12th of January 1759 ten Jesuits were arrested as members of the conspiracy against the King's life. Among these was Malagrida, a Milanese, who was confessor to the Tavora family.² The tribunal appointed to try them found them guilty. Some of the accused noblemen made confessions which were very damaging, especially to Malagrida; and several witnesses said they had heard the Jesuits talk of a divine judgment which was soon to fall upon the Portuguese Court.³ Among contemporaries, however, opinions were divided as to the guilt of the order, and Jesuit authors still affirm that the part alleged to have been taken by the members of their order in the attempted assassination was only a fable, which had sprung from Pombal's wish to assure his power over the weak and suspicious King.⁴

The case against Malagrida and the other members of his order gave Pombal the desired opportunity of getting at the Jesuits. A note was sent to Clement XIII., which pointed to their probable expulsion, and called upon the Chair of St Peter to join with the royal authority in putting an end to those acts of violence, which filled the whole of Europe with disgust and indignation.⁵ The Portuguese bishops sided with the government and sent out pastoral letters condemning the errors of the Jesuits and forbidding anyone to have anything to do with the members of the order. But the papal

¹ A. de Saint-Priest: *Histoire de la chute des Jésuites* (Paris 1846), 15f. ; Schäfer V, 264f.

² Adami, the General of the Servites, told Baron C. H. von Gleichen (*Souvenirs de C. H. Baron de Gleichen*, Paris 1868, 31) that when the news of Malagrida's imprisonment came to Rome, Cardinal Negroni was entertaining a party at dinner. Ricci was among the guests. Everybody advised him to write at once to the King of Portugal, and say that although the order was convinced of Malagrida's innocence the King was entreated to be merciful. But Ricci was inflexible. He wrote *une lettre folle* to the effect that a Jesuit could only be judged by the Society itself. The events which followed were the consequence.

³ J. Smith: *Memoirs of the Marquis of Pombal* (London 1843) I, 217f. ; II, 11f. Schäfer V, 281f. P. P. Wolf: *Allg. Geschichte der Jesuiten* (Zürich 1791), III, 8of.

⁴ So Duhr 424. The papal nuncio, Cardinal Acciaiuolo, is reported, however, to have said at Florence on his return from Portugal "that the Jesuits were undoubtedly the authors of the attempted assassination of his Majesty Dom Joseph."—*Memoirs of the Marquis of Pombal*, I, 286f.

⁵ Wolf III, 114f. Schäfer, 288f.

Secretary of State, Cardinal Torregiani, as well as Clement XIII. himself, took part with the order, and as it appeared impossible for Rome and Lisbon to make common cause against the Jesuits, a royal edict was issued (3rd September 1759) ordering all Jesuits to leave Portugal and the Portuguese colonies. Seven vessels of transport were made ready to carry all the Portuguese members of the order to the Papal States; but first an attempt was made to induce the younger men, who had not yet taken the solemn vows, to draw back. With most of them it was labour in vain; all but a few went on board singing the Psalm, *In exitu Israel de Ægypto, domus Jacob de populo barbaro*. The departing Jesuits had no doubt hoped that this scene would touch the spectators; but in this respect they were disappointed. The crowd watched their departure without showing sympathy, and the Portuguese clergy even struck a medal to celebrate their expulsion.¹ Later on all the possessions of the Jesuits in Portugal and the colonies were confiscated by the State; and Malagrida, who in prison had solaced himself with writing fanatical books about the immaculate conception of St Anne, and about Antichrist, was condemned to be led through the streets of Lisbon with a rope round his neck, and then to be strangled and burnt—not as a political offender, but as a heretic.

Events in Portugal were watched in the *salons* of Paris with mixed feelings. The philosophers were filled with contempt for Pombal, who during the trial had constantly feigned the greatest affection for the order of Loyola; and Voltaire thought it cowardice to condemn as a heretic the man who was accused of high treason.² On the other hand, advanced minds in Paris wished that Jesuitism, as the bulwark of superstition, might disappear from the face of the earth; and what happened in Portugal made people begin to talk loudly in France of expelling them from that country also. For the time, however, the Parliament of Paris was mostly occupied with a strenuous attempt to check the tide of materialistic and anti-christian literature. Helvetius' work *De l'Esprit* and Voltaire's poem on *Natural Religion*

¹ Wolf III, 139f. ; Crétineau-Joly V, 161f.

² Voltaire : *Précis du siècle de Louis XV.* (Dresden 1769) II, 282f.

were condemned to the flames, and the great *Encyclopædia* which now had reached its seventh volume, was committed for closer examination to a committee of lawyers and divines. On 8th March 1759 the privileges for printing this work were withdrawn, and some months later Clement XIII. issued a solemn condemnation of the *Encyclopædia*, and laid an interdict on its circulation. Shortly afterwards the Archbishop of Paris received permission at last to come back from Périgord, after a banishment of one-and-twenty months. This put new life into the attacks upon philosophy. In the Academy, Lefranc de Pompignan made a violent speech against the philosophers, and at the *Théâtre Français* a play by Palissot was acted, in which a servant, while stealing something from his master, says: "Now I shall become a philosopher." The Church and the government had a meeting-point in their common hatred of philosophy, and henceforth the philosophers were confronted by both opponents, who in their eyes became more and more a single enemy.¹

Under these strained conditions the attention of all was suddenly drawn to a lawsuit in which the Jesuits were involved. Upon the island of Martinique Loyola's order had a great trading station which was in brisk communication with Europe, and especially with France. A firm at Marseilles issued a bill of exchange for about three million francs, for which colonial produce was due. The ships which were to bring these wares to Marseilles were seized by the English, and the loss had serious consequences. Père La Valette, the director of the trade in Martinique, was obliged to offer to say Masses instead of repaying the large sum, and in consequence the firm at Marseilles was compelled to stop payment. Although the Jesuits could easily have raised the three million francs, they let the matter go to law, and on 8th May 1761 the *Grande Chambre* unanimously sentenced them to pay the sum with interest and compensation. When the rumours of this sentence reached Paris, there was general rejoicing. It was plain that people wished the French Jesuits to share the fate of the Portuguese. And ruin was much nearer at hand than the arrogant disciples of Loyola imagined.

¹ Rocquain, 213f.

During the lawsuit it was urged that the statutes of the order were a social danger, and the Parliament ordered them to be produced. The Jesuits dared not disobey, but got the King to demand that the statutes should be delivered up to him in order that (as it was said) he might have them examined. Meanwhile "an angel or a charitable soul" obtained another copy for the Parliament, and the members now took the examination into their own hands. By this examination it came to light that the Jesuits had been banished from France in 1594, and that when they returned in 1603 it was only on sufferance and without express permission. The Advocate-General now demanded that they should endeavour to procure such permission and receive no novices until it was granted. At the same time he accused them of holding pernicious doctrines, especially of defending murder and regicide. On the strength of this plea the Parliament condemned four-and-twenty Jesuit writings to the flames, and forbade the Jesuits to carry on their work of teaching until the whole case was sufficiently investigated.

This step made an immense sensation in Paris. It was expected that the *Grand Conseil* would interfere and prevent the decision of the Parliament from being carried out. This did not take place; but the King commanded that the case should be postponed for a year, and forty-five out of fifty French bishops publicly declared that no fault could be found with the conduct or doctrines of the Jesuits.¹ But the other Parliaments placed themselves on the side of the Parliament of Paris and began to examine the statutes of the order of the Jesuits. In order to ward off the threatening storm a royal commission called upon the French Jesuits to declare, that they rejected every doctrine which could possibly permit the use of violence against the sacred person of a king;² and that in their public and private theological lectures they would never advance anything contrary to the Gallican Articles.³ A hundred and sixteen French Jesuits at once signed the declaration,⁴ but Ricci refused to acknowledge the step; when Louis XV., to save the order, proposed the

¹ Rocquain, 226f.

² Reusch: *Beiträge*, 17f.

³ Reusch, 114f.

⁴ "Laudem eam præcipuè in sedem apostolicam observantiæ, quam hactenus obtinuerant, hac neque quaesita nec necessaria declaratione nullo suo emolumento amiserunt." So says Cordara; see Döllinger: *Beiträge* III, 34.

appointment of a native Vicar-General who should rule the French Jesuits with a general's authority, this also was rejected. As soon as the Bishop of Laon had stated the King's wishes to the General of the Jesuits, Ricci put the case before his assistants; and they referred the decision to the Pope. Clement XIII. saw clearly that other rulers could easily be tempted to demand a similar concession, and that a separate French General-Vicar would divide the French Jesuits from the rest of the order. Therefore he uttered the famous words: *Aut sint ut sunt, aut non sint*, and when Ricci brought this answer to the Bishop of Laon the negotiations were broken off.¹

Louis XV. still sought to shield the order by proposing to make it undergo a reformation, but Parliament would not yield. At the appointed time, 1st April 1762, the Jesuits were forced to stop their teaching, and all their papers were seized. On 6th August the same year, exactly a year after the commencement of the enquiry, the Parliament condemned a hundred and sixty-three Jesuit writings to the flames,² and declared the Society on French territory to be dissolved. The philosophers triumphed as if the victory were due to them. Diderot imagined how Voltaire, when he heard the news, would lift up his hands and eyes to heaven and say: "Lord, now lettest Thou Thy servant depart in peace; for mine eyes have seen Thy salvation!" But Voltaire himself saw more clearly the real cause of the defeat of the Jesuits. He says: "It is neither Sanchez nor Lessius nor Escobar, nor the absurdities of the Casuists, which have ruined the Jesuits; it is Le Tellier, and the Bull (*Unigenitus*), that have extirpated them in nearly the whole of France. The plough, which Le Tellier, the Jesuit, drove over the ruins of Port Royal, has produced those fruits which are now gathered after the lapse of sixty years."³

The course of events in France awoke the greatest consternation in Rome.⁴ On 3rd September Clement XIII. called together a secret Consistory, where he eased his

¹ Cordara, *loc. cit.*

² A list of them is given in Rocquain, 514f.

³ *Louis XV.* II, 288.

⁴ A. Theiner: *Geschichte des Pontificats Clemens' XIV.* II, 30f.

sorrowful mind by making a speech exceedingly hostile to France. The General of the Jesuits and those cardinals who were friends to the order at once urged him to print the speech. But the more moderate members of the Sacred College, headed by Lorenzo Ganganelli, the future Pope Clement XIV., begged him earnestly to refrain; for one reason, because he had started with the false premise that the Parliaments had forced the French Jesuits to acknowledge the Gallican liberties, while the truth was that the Jesuits had taken this step voluntarily, hoping to save their order from the threatening danger. This discovery made such an impression upon the weak Clement XIII. that he put his speech under lock and key, and forbade the cardinals to say a word more about publishing it, though he sent letters to several of the French prelates exhorting them to shield the persecuted Jesuits.

But from the midst of the French episcopate itself a vehement accusation was launched against the Society of Jesus. Fitz James, Bishop of Soissons, a son of the Duke of Berwick, the illegitimate son of James II., could not forget the misfortunes of his family, and at every opportunity laid the blame for them upon the Jesuits. He now wrote a pastoral letter¹ in which he condemned the Jesuit doctrines; and three other bishops joined him. In order to crush these attacks upon the Jesuits, Clement XIII. made the Inquisition issue a decree forbidding the circulation of Fitz James' pastoral letter; but the Parliament simply rejected the decree of the Inquisition. Still the Jesuits would not give in. One of their friends, a member of the episcopate, sent an open letter to the King in which he informed him that all good citizens and virtuous souls were horrified at what had befallen the Jesuits. Pamphlets appeared accusing the Parliament of violating justice; but others also appeared containing violent attacks upon the Jesuits. In one of these, which professed to treat of three "necessary" things, the writer advocated the banishment of the Jesuits, the extirpation of Christianity, and the killing of the Dauphin, who was a friend of the Jesuits. Many thought that this daring book originated in the camp of the Jesuits themselves, in order to frighten the Court and the moderates.²

¹ Reusch : *Index* II, 921.

² Rocquain, 237f.

After the dissolution of the order in France, most of the members found shelter in the provinces with bishops, noblemen, and people of wealth; but many still lived together as priests under their old rules, hoping that the tide would soon turn, when they could quickly reorganise themselves. For the time there was no prospect of such a turn. After a new royal edict had shut them out from the schools, another declared that all their property now belonged to the State. In vain the Archbishop of Paris again dared to raise his voice on their behalf. The Parliament burnt his pastoral letter and begged the King to punish the "incurable" prelate. Louis XV. granted their prayer, and banished Beaumont to a distance of forty miles from Paris.

In order to strike the Jesuits still more sensibly the Parliament demanded (February 1764) that they should swear that they would neither singly, nor together, follow the constitutions of their order, that they would break off all connexion with their leaders, and would abjure the doctrines set forth in an anthology of their assertions (*Extraits des assertions des Jésuites*). A subsequent Act of Parliament further decided that any Jesuit who would not within eight days take this oath should leave the kingdom. Consequently exile was the only possible thing for most of them.¹ In these desperate circumstances many friends of the Jesuits advised Clement XIII. to summon a French National Council, in hopes that it would protect the order. This was certainly a most unfortunate plan. It was opposed, among others, by Cardinal Ganganelli, who represented to the Pope that such a Council would probably lead to a schism.

Louis XV. now thought that there was nothing else to be done but to issue a new decree (November 1764) abolishing for ever the Society of Jesus in his kingdom. At the same time he decided that all lawsuits against the Jesuits and their friends should be stopped immediately; and the Archbishop of Paris received permission to return. Former Jesuits were also allowed to remain in France if they would break off all connexion with their order and act as priests under the usual superintendence of the bishops. Only from Paris and its immediate neighbourhood were they ordered temporarily to keep aloof; but a prospect was opened to them of entering the capital if they behaved well and gave no cause for complaint.

¹ A. Theiner I, 33f.

At this moment the General of the Jesuits prevailed upon the feeble Clement XIII., without the knowledge of his Secretary of State, to issue a document, which re-established the Society of Jesus and defended it against those unjust charges, as the Pope considered them, which had been brought against it. This was the Constitution *Apostolicum pascendi* of 7th January 1765. This Constitution had been composed with the greatest secrecy by Ricci and a few prelates at the papal Court who were friends of the order. Its appearance caused anxiety to some of the best friends of the Jesuits in Rome,¹ but great joy to others, as can be seen from the grateful letter sent to Clement XIII. by the Bishop (since canonised) of Sant' Agata dei Goti.² Every bishop was immediately made acquainted with this Constitution through the nuncios; but only thirteen Spanish prelates, two French, seven Italian, and one Bohemian, thanked the Pope for this defence of Jesuitism, and through the replies of these prelates the Pope learned once more how numerous were the enemies of the order in all countries. Before long this enmity showed itself more strongly. Tanucci, the well-known reforming minister of the King of the Two Sicilies, immediately informed the papal nuncio at Naples that the latest Constitution was a very unwise document, and its circulation in the united kingdoms was forbidden under penalty of heavy fines. Venice, Tuscany, Parma, and Modena all followed the example of Naples with more or less severity; in Lombardy the Governor of Milan prohibited not only this document, but the notorious Maundy Thursday Bull (*In cœna Domini*). The Parliament of Paris likewise immediately prohibited this untimely Constitution, and in Portugal it was decided that anyone who should dare to have it in his possession or to distribute it among others, should be guilty of high treason and forfeit his honour, office, and property. The rage against Rome and the Jesuits had now reached such a point in Portugal, that they would not even receive a letter from the Pope.³

In Spain also the new Constitution caused the smouldering hatred of the Jesuits to leap into flame. Already in January 1762, King Carlos III. had issued a so-called Pragmatic

¹ Theiner I, 37.

² *Lettere di S. Alfonso Maria de' Liguori* (Roma 1887) I, 566.

³ Theiner I, 43.

Sanction, which limited considerably the privileges of the religious orders; and in Spain the Jesuits had many opponents in the episcopate. When a good number of the fugitive Jesuits from France sought shelter there, some of the bishops even refused them permission to say Mass. As soon as the new Constitution was published, the papal nuncio in Spain reported to Rome that nearly all were agreed that it was untimely and harmful, and that it was generally looked upon as a work of the Jesuits, and an evidence of the power which they possessed in the immediate entourage of the Pope.¹

This rash Constitution only had the effect of increasing ill-will towards the Papacy in all Roman Catholic states. Decrees were everywhere passed which made even the smallest documents proceeding from St Peter's Chair the object of searching suspicion, and their publication without royal consent was forbidden. In Spain, where the Jesuits had long enjoyed much power in the schools, people began to criticise their educational labours, and their friends and adherents lost their high offices in Church and State. As a counter-move the Spanish Jesuits attacked several of the reforms which had lately been set on foot. This attack on the work of the government caused serious disturbances. When Aranda and others of Carlos III.'s Ministers were pointed out by the Jesuits as being the cause of all the disturbances in Spain, a royal decree was issued on 2nd April 1767, abolishing the Society of Jesus as far as Spain was concerned, and banishing all Spanish Jesuits from the country. After the publication of this decree nearly five thousand Spanish Jesuits were put on board transports and sent to Civit  Vecchia. There they were driven away with cannon shot. It was already difficult enough for Rome to provide for their brother Jesuits who had fled from Portugal and France; so the unfortunate exiles were compelled to roam about on the sea until the Duke of Choiseul gave the Governor of Corsica permission to open that island to them. In spite of all that these poor wretches had suffered, they could not resist the temptation of making an attempt to get back to Spain. In Spanish convents which had had Jesuit confessors, visionary women had proclaimed that great judgments were coming upon Spain, the destruction of all the

¹ Cp. the despatch of the nuncio to the Papal Secretary in Theiner I, 44f.

Bourbons, and the overthrow of religion.¹ As soon as this report reached Corsica two hundred and fifty Jesuits ventured to creep back into Spain. Their audacity was at once discovered, and new and severe penal laws were enacted, to be enforced also in the Spanish possessions in America and India, to keep the Jesuits for ever away from the fatherland of the Founder of their order.

The banishment of the Jesuits from Spain came as a complete surprise to the Pope. Rome had not expected such a measure from a prince whose father had been the first to choose Jesuits for his confessors, and whose mother was a Farnese, of the family of Pope Paul III.² The worst of it was that events in Spain added fresh fuel to the hatred of the Jesuits in France. Carlos III. at once sent the "Pragmatic Sanction" to Louis XV. with an explanation of the reasons which had led to its issue. In the course of the negotiations which were opened between the cabinets of Madrid and Versailles, the Duke of Choiseul said: "If the Pope were wise, enlightened, and of a firm character, he would not attempt any other remedy than the total abolition of the order by means of a Bull."³ Already before the end of April the Parliament of Paris had decided that the Jesuits should be turned out of all French possessions, and on 8th May a decree was issued commanding all Jesuits to leave France within fourteen days. After short intervals the Parliaments in the provinces followed the example of Paris; that of Aix even proposed that the Jesuits should be banished from the papal territories of Avignon and Venaissin, and that these should be annexed if Rome would not agree. This bold Parliament of Aix even proposed that the Pope should be forced to abolish the Society of Jesus for ever.

The desire for the total abolition of the order became more and more marked. When Portugal made overtures to Rome, Clement XIII. declared that the recall of the Jesuits was an indispensable condition of the restoration of former relations.⁴ But Pombal would not hear of it. On the contrary, he formed

¹ Cordara in Döllinger III, 39.

² Cordara, 36f.

³ The Duke de Choiseul to the Marquis d'Aubeterre, 21st April 1762; Theiner I, 68; Rocquain, 259.

⁴ Smith: *Memoirs of the Marquis of Pombal* II, 80f. Theiner I, 72f.

a plan that Spain, France, and Portugal should unite in a league and demand the abolition of the order, threatening to call a General Council if this demand were not acceded to. The Portuguese statesmen even thought of coming to an understanding with the Jansenists at Utrecht, and so causing an open schism. Clement XIII. tried in vain to make an impression on King Joseph by writing him a letter with his own hand. The King answered that Portugal would not come to terms with St Peter's Chair before the order of the Jesuits was abolished. At the same time, Tanucci, on behalf of the King of the Two Sicilies, had all the Jesuits from Naples and Sicily conveyed in a miserable plight to the frontier of the Papal States, and the Grand Master of the order of St John sent away the Jesuits who were in Malta. Everything indicated that the days of the order would soon be numbered, for popular feeling rose against them everywhere. Even in Rome, in some circles, there was much ill-will against them, because of the humane manner in which Clement XIII. had provided for the expelled Portuguese Jesuits, and passed over others to make them chaplains to the Roman hospitals, confessors in nunneries, parish priests, and canons.

In spite of all, some of the French philosophers watched the death struggles of Jesuitism with much sympathy. They hated the Jesuit *canaille* just as much as that of the Jansenists and of the Parliaments, but they were disgusted at the hypocrisy which made many statesmen, like Pombal, allege zeal for the Church as their reason for persecuting the order of Loyola.¹ In their view of the matter the King of Sardinia was right when he gave to Cordara, as the true and real reason for hating the Jesuits, their riches and the predominance of their order over all others.² The French philosophers had no appreciation of the moral wrath which found vent in Jansen's *Augustinus* and Pascal's *Provincial Letters*, and the earnestness of the Jansenists was very irksome to them. In 1765 D'Alembert published anonymously a book entitled *Histoire de la destruction des Jésuites*. According to Diderot this caused more sensation in Paris than the author's four volumes of mathematics.³ D'Alembert's sympathy with the persecuted

¹ For Pombal's "Apology" see his *Memoirs* II, 140f.

² Cordara, 35.

³ J. Bertrand: *D'Alembert*, 119.

order is apparent throughout the book. His lucubrations issue in the assertion that the destruction of Jesuitism will certainly be of great advantage to "Reason," but only on condition that Jansenist intolerance be not substituted for that of the Jesuits. At all events the Jesuits were reasonable people who could wink at the ways of others, and allow them to keep their thoughts in peace, if only the outward part was right. But the Jansenists were not so considerate; therefore they seemed to D'Alembert to be barbarians worse than the English Puritans. And Voltaire wrote after the expulsion of the Jesuits from France: "It is dreadful to be exposed to the attacks of wolves when you have got rid of the foxes."¹

Doubtless many of the other spokesmen of the *Esprit philosophique* agreed with D'Alembert and Voltaire. Sympathy with the Jesuits could only show itself in glimpses, for in many cases it was choked by that hatred of the Church which found its classic expression in the watchword of Voltaire and the philosophers: *Ecrasez l'infâme, écrasez la*,² first heard in 1762, when the first violent blow was struck at Loyola's French disciples.

In this memorable year Rousseau's *Émile* and *Contrat social* both saw the light. *Émile*, which was printed in Holland, was burnt by the Parliament, and the Archbishop of Paris warned people against it in a special pastoral letter. But everybody read it, and at the end of half a year it was in all the booksellers' windows in Paris.³ This Natural Gospel of Education gained an influence which few books attain. The Savoyard priest, who, in spite of the shipwreck of his Christian faith, wished to remain in his office, became a pattern for many French priests. And his deistic confession, with its easily perceptible reminiscences of Descartes,⁴ carried on a quiet Propaganda, until one day it became the official creed of France. *Émile* gave the impulse to a brisk discussion of educational problems, during which it became apparent that the French schools had really entered on a new phase, in spite

¹ *Recueil des lettres* (Paris 1784) X, 478. The date of the letter is 6th May 1768. Cp. p. 360.

² It is clear that *l'infâme* was intended to mean the Church, not Christ. Strauss: *Voltaire*, 188f.

³ Rocquain, 235.

⁴ F. Bouillier: *Histoire de la philosophie cartésienne* (Paris 1854) II, 634f.

of the outward likeness to the old. The *Encyclopædia*, which in this case is an unwilling witness, declared as early as 1751 that the pupils as a rule left the schools "with such a superficial knowledge of religion, that the first ungodly conversation, or the first dangerous reading, was too much for them."¹ The pupils soon encountered the "ungodly conversations" and the "dangerous reading" in the schools themselves. *L'esprit philosophique* soon penetrated the Sorbonne to such an extent that the Abbé Morelles, who belonged to that school of thought, could rejoice that Reason was getting by degrees the better of theological stupidities.² In the Sorbonne, they began to defend theses which bore the impress of Locke's and Condillac's philosophy;³ even in Saint Sulpice the philosophic spirit was felt. The pupils at the seminary thought the old prayers too long and too mystical.⁴ A deacon was caught reading Helvetius' *de l'Esprit* during a procession, and there were complaints from all sides of the worldly-mindedness of the future priests. The expulsion of the Jesuits had important consequences in the schools. It was not easy for the teaching communities such as the Benedictines and Oratorians to get the requisite number of Christian teachers in a hurry, and they often had to resort to lay masters who were more or less tainted with the *Esprit philosophique*.⁵

At the same time that *Émile* was influencing parents and teachers, the *Contrat social* made an immense impression on statesmen and thoughtful citizens.⁶ In the remarkable eighth chapter, where Rousseau treats of the so-called civic religion, he counts the Romish Church with Lamaism and the Japanese religion among those curious systems "which give men two sets of laws, two sovereigns, and two countries; and which lay upon them duties which are mutually contradictory, and prevent men from being at the same time good citizens and pious men." The Christianity of the Gospel is in his opinion immeasurably better, but it is contrary to the social spirit. A community of real Christians would not be a community of men and women.

¹ Under the word *Collège*.

² A. Sicard: *L'éducation morale et civique avant et pendant la révolution* (Paris 1884), 137.

³ Sicard, 163f.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 139.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 144.

⁶ A. Chuquet: *J. J. Rousseau* (Paris 1893), 147f.

It is in the interest of the State that every citizen should have a religion which inspires him with love of duty, but the doctrines are a matter of indifference to the State. There are, however, certain *sentiments de sociabilité*, without which one can neither be a good citizen nor a loyal subject. These dogmas in the civic religion are of a moral, rather than a religious, nature, and should be as few as possible. They could really be limited to the Savoyard priest's belief in a Supreme Being, conscience, and the immortality of the soul. It is the business of the sovereign to decide upon these articles of faith; he should not force anyone to believe them, but he may exile those citizens who do not accept them, not for impiety, but on the ground of their being *insociables*. Besides these dogmas the State should maintain the principle that intolerance is altogether objectionable. "Anyone who says, Outside the Church there is no salvation! should be expelled from the State."

Voltaire, himself also a deist, agreed with Rousseau in his views on the relations between Church and State. He exerted himself to make princes see that priests were the greatest enemies of monarchy, and the philosophers the best support against the encroachments of the clergy. He thought the time had come for the State to resume the power which the Church had usurped in the Middle Ages. The Church should no longer be allowed to rule the community. He took up Boniface VIII.'s old idea about the impossibility of the Church and State having equal power, but came to the opposite conclusion. In his opinion it was the State, not the Church, that should rule. Could two masters be tolerated in a house, the father and the children's teacher, who is paid by the father? For himself and a little band of superior intellects he claimed full freedom of thought, but a positive religion was necessary to preserve order in the community. A philosopher might be an atheist, but a statesman should be a theist.¹ Nevertheless he sent out from Ferney a succession of writings which all more or less tended to undermine the inherited faith of the French people. Most of these books were small (*petits livrets*), because it was easier to get books of that kind distributed among young men and women. He felt himself to be the apostle of a new church, the chief dogma of which was Tolerance, which he preached with

¹ Joyau : *La philosophie en France pendant la révolution*, 34f.

enthusiasm in his *Traité de la Tolérance* and other works ; and when he heard that this book was read at Court, and saw its effect in the trial of Jean Calas, he cried : " The scales are falling from men's eyes ; the kingdom of Truth is at hand ! " " God is blessing our new Church." ¹

The Parliaments had great difficulty in stopping the circulation of these dangerous books, but they did their best. Fr Melchior Grimm foresaw that the time would soon come when it would be just as difficult to find philosophical books in Paris as in Constantinople. Yet in spite of the vigilance of the police the prohibited books were circulated. Even among the police officials " the new Church " had willing " brethren " and " confederates " who saw to the distribution of the works of Voltaire and the Encyclopædists. And the government often hesitated to deal too violently with persons who received autograph letters from the King of Prussia, and one sign of favour after another from the Empress of Russia.² The freethinkers held well together. Ever since 1759, when the *Encyclopædia* was forbidden, the Encyclopædists and those who thought with them had formed a league, the object of which was " to raise the throne of Reason upon the ruins of dogma." To many it appeared that this object would soon be gained. When Diderot, in 1767, during a visit to Baron Holbach at Grandval, received a parcel of books attacking the Church and Christianity, he wrote : " I do not know what is to become of the poor Church of Jesus Christ or of the prophecy that the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." And a bishop is reported to have said : " At the rate at which everything is going now, religion can not have fifty years to live." ³

The adherents of the *Esprit philosophique* were still more confirmed in their triumphant conviction that the future belonged to them, when they saw the Society of Jesus abolished by a brief from the Pope.

¹ *Recueil des lettres* VII, 384, 403.

² Rocquain 250f.

³ *Ibid.*, 263f.

CHAPTER III

THE ABOLITION OF THE ORDER OF THE JESUITS

THE idea of forcing a total abolition of Loyola's order, by making joint representations to the Pope, gained ground among the Bourbon princes and statesmen, and a fresh unwise proceeding of Clement XIII. made the princes put the thought into action.

Ever since 1731, when the house of Farnese became extinct, and the Infante Don Carlos, son of Philip V. of Spain, took to himself the government of Parma and Piacenza, the popes had claimed to be the real lords of those states. Every year on the eve of St Peter's Day they made a solemn protest against the Spanish prince's usurpation of what presumably belonged to the successors and heirs of Paul III., the former Cardinal Farnese; and when the young Duke Ferdinand of Parma, in spite of the protest of his bishop, permitted himself to invade the rights and dignities of the Church, his action caused the greatest indignation at Rome. Clement XIII. first warned the Duke Infante; but as this had no effect he issued an edict (30th January 1768) declaring all Ferdinand's measures, which were contrary to the laws of the Church, to be null and void, and threatening him and his counsellors with excommunication under the "Bull of Maundy Thursday" (*In cœna Domini*) if they did not at once bow to the see of St Peter.

But this was not to be thought of. What Duke Ferdinand had done was perfectly approved of by his paternal uncle, King Carlos III. of Spain, and also by his maternal grandfather, Louis XV. of France. The Pope's threat only served to draw out the family feeling of the Bourbons. The Bourbon family treaty was made on 15th August 1761, originally as a counter-move against England; among other things it contained a sentence that who-

ever attacked one of the two thrones attacked both. King Ferdinand I. of the Two Sicilies and the Infante Ferdinand, Duke of Parma, both came under the treaty as the son and nephew of Carlos III., and therefore the attack roused all the reigning Bourbons. Unwise prophecies and personal satires and satirical pictures, directed against the Spanish king and his counsellors, enraged the Spaniards still more, and both Carlos III. and Louis XV. advised the Duke of Parma to take no notice whatever of the papal letters, but to send all the Jesuits of Parma to the Papal States. This advice was followed and there came a fresh protest from Rome. It made no impression on the allied princes; Naples answered by absorbing the Papal peculiars of Benevento and Pontecorvo, and France those of Avignon and Venaissin.

These reprisals caused the greatest consternation at Rome. Clement XIII. was so overcome by grief and anger that it was thought necessary to bleed him; his Secretary of State, Torregiani, was likewise so affected that he had to undergo the same operation.¹ As soon as the Pope had somewhat recovered, he wrote and complained to Carlos III., but, instead of considering this complaint, the Spanish king sent a secret order to his representative at the chair of St Peter to demand that Rome should withdraw at all points. The Spanish representative was to insist upon Clement XIII.'s recalling and destroying the letter against Parma; recognising the sovereignty of the Infante, and submitting to the loss of Benevento and Pontecorvo, Avignon and Venaissin; banishing Cardinal Torregiani and the General of the Jesuits from Rome, and abolishing the order.² The old relations between Spain and St Peter's see could only be renewed on such conditions. Carlos III. also tried to draw Maria Theresa into the coalition against the Jesuits. The wise and prudent empress answered that she had no reason to work for the abolition of the order, but, if the Holy Father thought such a step necessary, she would neither oppose it nor disapprove.

The papal diplomatists tried in vain to make the Bourbon Courts look with more favour on the disciples of Loyola. The Spanish ambassador at Paris, a friend of the Jesuits, whose wife

¹ D'Aubeterre to Choiseul, 22nd June 1768. Theiner I, 109.

² Theiner I, 115.

was descended from the family of St Aloysius of Gonzaga, and who had two brothers of his own in the order, informed the papal nuncio in Paris that the fire which was burning in Spain could only be quenched by the abolition of the order. When this was done, Spain would do anything for Rome, and Rome would be able also to help to stop the progress of infidelity which was spreading in Spain as elsewhere.¹ Carlos III. sent one courier after another to Versailles to induce Louis XV. to take common action against the Jesuits. At last, in the beginning of 1769, France, Spain, and the Two Sicilies jointly demanded that the order of the Jesuits should be abolished. To gain time, the Roman Jesuits made Clement XIII. claim an explanation of the reasons for the demand; but even Lorenzo Ricci began now to lose heart. He told the French ambassador at Rome, in a confidential conversation, that the rage of the people might be turned upon the Society of Jesus to such a degree, that its members would be in danger of life and limb.² It is said that Clement XIII. thought of bringing forward the case of the order in a Consistory which was fixed for 3rd February; but he died the night before; sorrow and anxiety had sapped his remaining strength.

The Conclave which met on 15th February 1769 was in an unusual degree an object of interest to all politicians.³ The health of Clement XIII. had long been so doubtful that the election of a new pope had been looked upon as a near contingency, and the different governments had for some time been considering what position they would take when the time came. All the Roman Catholic princes wished for a pope of a different stamp from Clement XIII. and one who would not choose Torregiani for his Secretary of State. Carlos III. went still further; his opinion was that they should make sure beforehand that the new Pope would abolish the Jesuit order. The Jesuits felt what was in the air, and did everything to avert the catastrophe. All intrigues that could be devised either before or during a Conclave were brought into operation.

Cardinal Rezzonico, a cousin of Clement XIII., rallied the

¹ Theiner I, 121.

² *Ibid.*, 124.

³ Petruccelli della Gattina IV, 17of.; F. Masson: *Le Cardinal de Bernis* (Paris 1884), 77f.

friends of the Jesuits among the cardinals, the so-called *Zelanti*, round himself; but the opposite party, the "Cardinals of the Crowned Heads," formed a counter-organisation. The Jesuits wanted a quick election, because that would make it easier to place one of their friends in St Peter's chair, and Ricci advised the cardinals to provide a new head for Christendom as soon as possible. But the diplomatists objected, and the French ambassador, the Marquis d'Aubeterre, informed the members of the Conclave in his own name and that of the Spanish *Chargé d'affaires* that they would both leave Rome immediately if the Jesuit General's advice were followed. This threat answered its purpose. For a long time, more than a third of the cardinals would not vote; they would not hear of finishing the Conclave before the arrival of the French and Spanish cardinals—two from either country.¹

The foreign cardinals kept them waiting a long time. One of the French cardinals, Bernis, Archbishop of Albi, had great difficulty in getting together the considerable sum which was necessary for the journey, and the Spanish cardinals were so afraid of the sea that they got off the man-of-war, which the government had put at their disposal, to pursue the journey by land. During the long time of waiting, the Conclave had the unexpected honour (16th March) of a visit from two princes who were soon to cost St Peter's see serious anxieties—the Grand Duke Leopold of Tuscany and his brother the Emperor Joseph II. Both princes were admitted to the assembly of the cardinals, and the various members of the Conclave were presented to them. When some of the cardinals asked the young Emperor to protect the new pope, he answered: "You can do that best yourselves by your own wisdom, in choosing a pope who will keep the rule *ne quid nimis*, and who will not force matters on." When Cardinal Torregiani was presented, Joseph II said rather coldly: "I have very often heard him mentioned!" It was quite plain that the Jesuit party could not expect any support from the two young princes.² Joseph II. wrote home to his mother: "We saw the Conclave. As all the

¹ Theiner I, 173.

² *Ibid.*, 183f., following the letters of Cardinal Orsini and the Marquis d'Aubeterre.

cardinals begged us to go in, we let ourselves be persuaded. It is rather amusing to see it, especially because one so seldom has the chance.”¹

The instructions given by the Duke of Choiseul to the French cardinals were, that they should act in concert with their Spanish and Sicilian brethren. The Archbishop of Naples, who was the candidate of Spain and the Sicilies, would also be acceptable to France, and there were a few cardinals, such as Torregiani, who were not to be elected; but otherwise the French government had no special wishes as to the person of the future pope. Its chief interest lay in a different direction—the retention of Avignon and Venaissin—which the Parliaments would not give up.² The Spaniards were instructed to demand three concessions—the abolition of the Society of Jesus, the cession of Avignon and Venaissin to France, and of Pontecorvo and Benevento to Naples.³ Of these three claims Carlos III. evidently had the first most at heart. The Cardinal Archbishop of Seville, the spokesman of the Spaniards, thought that there was no reason why the future pope should not give a definite promise, either in writing or in the presence of witnesses, to abolish the Jesuit order. But in Cardinal Bernis’ opinion such a plan was contrary to all canonical laws, and he urged that a cardinal who would stoop to give such a promise was not to be trusted.⁴ The Cardinal of Seville, however, was not moved by this objection; he and the other Spanish cardinal had come with the firm determination “to take good care not to be fooled by the Frenchmen.”⁵

But where was a cardinal to be found who had the qualities necessary for a pope, and was at the same time willing to fetter himself by such a bond? Even Cordara admits that there were not many “papable” cardinals in the Conclave of 1769.⁶ The Marquis d’Aubeterre, who did not share Cardinal Bernis’ scruples about binding the future pope, had long had his eye on Lorenzo Ganganelli, and the

¹ A. von Arneth: *Maria Theresia und Joseph II. Ihr Correspondenz* (Wien 1867) I, 243. Letter of 18th March.

² Masson, 94f.

³ Petruccelli della Gattina IV, 172f.

⁴ Masson, 100.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 107.

⁶ Cordara, 40.

Spanish cardinals voted for him immediately after they had entered the Conclave.¹ But could Ganganelli be trusted? He had attended the Jesuit school at Rimini; it was said that he had to thank the General of the Jesuits for the hat which Clement XIII. had given him,² and Cardinal Rezzonico seemed to be willing to vote for him. It was no wonder that the Spaniards began to doubt, and refused to work in earnest for his election as long as he had not bound himself in any way. As far as can be gathered from Bernis' later despatches,³ Ganganelli complied with the wishes of the Spanish cardinals, and, as a theologian (*en qualité de théologien*), recognised, in writing, the possibility that the future pope, with due respect to Canon Law, and without violating the rules of wisdom and justice, might, with a clear conscience, abolish the Society of Jesus. Crétineau-Joly, the historian of the Jesuits, who, it must be owned, was anything but trustworthy,⁴ says that he had held in his hand a note of Ganganelli's to that effect; but that note has not since been found in the Spanish archives. Several historians, therefore, ignoring Crétineau-Joly, and calling attention to Cardinal Bernis' *légèreté proverbiale*, deny that Ganganelli ever wrote such a note. It is certain that the Cardinal of Seville concealed this document from Bernis, and it was only afterwards from the lips of the new Pope himself that Bernis heard of this ambiguous declaration. But Bernis' account of what the Pope had afterwards told him about this note has such a stamp of reality that there does not seem to be sufficient reason to doubt its truth.

After receiving Ganganelli's declaration, the Spaniards firmly supported his candidature. When Bernis noticed this, he approached the confidential agent of Austria in the Conclave, Cardinal Pozzobonelli, in order to discover the attitude of the Court of Vienna. As he found sympathy in that quarter, he resolved to bring the long and tiring Conclave to an end as soon as possible. On the evening of the 17th May he

¹ Theiner I, 211.

² Masson, 141.

³ See below, p. 66. Masson 107, 149.

⁴ With regard to him, see A. von Druffel in the *Hist. Zeitschrift*, 1884; cp. also U. Maynard: *J. Crétineau-Joly* (Paris 1875), 301f.

sent his "Conclavist" to Ganganelli to let him know what the general feeling was. At first Ganganelli gave out that he would not accept the election, but by degrees he began to discuss different questions which showed that the thought of obtaining the tiara had not been quite foreign to his mind. The French conclavist told him, so it is said, that the three governments expected him to meet them half way, especially in abolishing the Society of Jesus, and in giving satisfaction to the Duke of Parma. Ganganelli answered that he had thought out a plan which would easily settle the last point, and he was convinced that the abolition of the Jesuit order was "necessary," but it ought, he said, to be carried out with due observance of all the proper forms. When the conclavist asked what forms he had specially in view, he answered that the approval of the Catholic Courts and of their clergy ought to be obtained; and so the conversation ended.¹

Next evening (18th May), Bernis again sent his conclavist to Ganganelli's cell; this time furnished with a memorandum, of which the chief purpose was to show what gratitude the future Pope owed to the French cardinals, who had taken such an important part in his election. Ganganelli answered that he had always had an affection for France, and that he bore Louis XV. in his heart, and Cardinal Bernis in his right hand. The memorandum expressed anxiety, lest the observance of all the forms which had been mentioned with respect to the abolition of the Society of Jesus might place the new Pope in a false light, and that in any case it would retard the business. But Ganganelli reassured Bernis by declaring that events would justify the methods which he would choose. And when Bernis wished also to know how the reconciliation with Parma was to be effected, Ganganelli confided to him, under promise of secrecy, that he thought of marrying the Infante-Duke at Rome with his own hands to the Austrian Archduchess who was chosen to be his bride. Such a proceeding on the part of the new Pope would cancel all the threats and curses of Clement XIII. against Parma. In reference to the wish expressed in the memorandum, that France should be allowed

¹ Bernis to Choiseul, 19th May, 1769. Masson, 108.

to retain Avignon, and Naples Benevento, he only said that he would leave that point entirely to the King's conscience.¹

After these declarations Bernis had no doubt that Ganganelli ought to be pope, and all the more so because he had readily agreed to appoint as his Secretary of State and other high officials the persons suggested by the Cardinal of Albi. So Bernis went at a late hour of the night to Cardinal Pozzobonelli, with whom he also found Rezzonico. The three cardinals at once agreed that next day they would make all their partisans vote for Ganganelli; and as the party led by the two Cardinals Albani would likewise vote for him, full unanimity would be reached. On the 19th May, forty-six out of the forty-seven voting papers bore the name of Lorenzo Ganganelli; he had himself voted for Rezzonico, who hitherto, during the whole time of the Conclave, had not received a single vote.² The new Pope took the name of Clement XIV. in gratitude to Clement XIII. for having given him the purple, and also as a token that he wished to throw a veil of oblivion over the ill-will which his predecessor had often shown him of late years.

Clement XIV. had at an early age been adopted into the order of St Francis; his nature was peaceable and harmonious, and the constant disagreements between Clement XIII. and the secular powers had always been distasteful to him. As we have seen, he had again and again raised his voice among the cardinals in the cause of moderation and reasonableness. In spite of the name, he did not mean to be a repetition of Clement XIII. He was anxious and suspicious, and trusted only himself, his Franciscan confessor, and his Franciscan cook; and all the Jesuit eyes which watched him everywhere made him feel uncomfortable. The French ambassador wrote to the Duke of Choiseul, in the days of Clement XIII., that the Jesuits held all the entrances to the Pope's palace, so that whichever way Clement XIII. turned he always heard the same story.³ As the confessors of the nobles, Loyola's disciples took a leading part in the Roman *salons*, and everywhere in the Papal States they were in power. The new Pope was by no means a favourite

¹ See the conclusion of the despatch last mentioned.

² Theiner I, 220.

³ Schäfer: *Geschichte von Portugal* V, 343.

in the best Roman society, so Joseph II. wrote to his mother,—the Pope being of humble birth and a sworn enemy of the Jesuits.¹ Clement XIV. on his part did not like the enormous influence of the Jesuits. His predecessor had been accustomed to discuss all important questions with the cardinals and the General of the Jesuits. Clement XIV. would not follow this plan. Partly on principle, and partly from anxiety, he decided to act entirely on his own account; only facts and not reasons should in future be made known to the cardinals. In his person an enlightened absolutism ascended St Peter's throne,—though certainly in rather a frightened form. He succeeded in breaking free from the yoke of the cardinals; but to make up for this, the representatives of the foreign powers had much more influence under him than under his predecessor.

This rupture with the cardinals and dependence on the foreign governments made Clement XIV. very unpopular in Rome. The slighted cardinals drew back resentfully from the silent and suspicious Pope; and their resentment infected the Romans, who in so many ways depended upon their Eminences, and who suffered besides under the parsimony of the new Pope and his serious efforts to raise the deeply depressed finances of the Papacy.

With the foreign Courts Clement XIV. quickly came to a good understanding. Maria Theresa had had scruples about giving her consent to her daughter's marriage with the Infante-Duke of Parma as long as the dispute with Rome was not settled. A dispensation from Rome was necessary, because of the near relationship of the bride and bridegroom. This was now sent immediately,² and so the effect of the violent measures of Clement XIII. against Parma was quietly neutralised. But with the abolition of the Society of Jesus things did not go so easily. On 31st May the Marquis d'Aubeterre informed the Duke of Choiseul that he had expressed the wishes of France in this matter. Clement XIV. had asked for time, as it could not be done in a moment; especially as, according to the ambassador, the Pope "so far was accustomed to do everything himself."³

¹ Arneth: *Maria Theresia und Joseph II.* I, 273.

² Joseph II. to Maria Theresa; Arneth I, 284.

³ Theiner I, 336.

When D'Aubeterre soon after was recalled to France, Cardinal Bernis was made the French ambassador to the see of St Peter, and as the representative of the head of the Bourbon Courts, he took over for a time the management of the negotiations with the Pope. Everything was done in the greatest secrecy. The General of the Augustinian order, who was a Spaniard and well known in Rome, was one of the few who were initiated; he was to help Cardinal Bernis with good advice. But in spite of every precaution the Jesuits found out what was in the wind, and took all possible pains to follow the course of events by the help of spies. In order to frighten the Pope, they spread abroad prophecies that he would die before he had time to sign the paper abolishing the order.¹ But Cardinal Bernis was able to reassure his government with the news that Clement XIV. would not allow himself to be scared by these Jesuit prophecies, but had given Padre Georgi, a theologian of the Augustinian order, the task of making a draft of the brief of dissolution. At the same time, however, he did not conceal his anxiety lest Clement's incessant labour should injure his health.

The whole affair progressed much more slowly than Carlos III. wished, and would perhaps have gone yet more slowly if the Jesuits had not again roused universal exasperation by announcing to the world, in a boastful manner, that their missionaries had received the same privileges and indulgences that other missionaries usually received. In order to make a display of this papal favour, as if it were evidence of the present Pope's protection of their order, they had the papal letter to their missionaries printed and distributed everywhere. All that they gained by it was that on 22nd July Cardinal Bernis in the name of France, Spain, and Naples explicitly demanded the abolition of the order. Clement XIV. endeavoured to moderate the anger of the allied princes by expressing his astonishment at the "audacity" with which the Jesuits boasted of a letter, which in reality only contained what was given to all workers in the mission field. He also held out the prospect of two new letters being issued which would reduce the pride of the reverend fathers, adding that he would show the world that he was not afraid of doing his duty. Cardinal Bernis wrote to his

¹ Bernis to Choiseul, 13th July 1769. Theiner I, 340.

government: "After this the Holy Father spoke to me with much spirit, clearness, and force about the abolition of the Jesuit order. He said to me that in this affair he must consider his conscience and his honour;—his conscience, because he must respect the laws of the Church and the example set by his predecessors on similar occasions; his honour, because he could not lightly disregard the deference due to those who had *not* demanded the abolition, *i.e.*, the Emperor and Empress, the Polish Republic, the King of Sardinia, the Venetians, the Genoese, and even the King of Prussia."¹ Clement XIV. did not conceal, however, from the Cardinal of Albi that he feared for his life, and he asked for time to carry out his plan, if for no other reason but that the world should not believe that he had bound himself before his election to fulfil the wishes of the allied princes. Two days later Bernis wrote in a private letter to Choiseul: "That document which they (the Spaniards) had got the Pope to sign, was in no wise binding; the Pope has himself told me what it contained. His Holiness is afraid of being poisoned, he distrusts all his entourage, and does not confide in anyone."² In the beginning of August, Bernis further informed his government that an attempt had been made to remove the Franciscan who kept the Pope's papers and keys, and also the friar of the same order who looked after the Pope's kitchen. He also said that Clement XIV. took more and more precautions with his food and drink.³ The confidence which the Pope always placed in him made an impression on him, and he did his best to defend Clement XIV.'s delay against the impatient princes.

In reality France could well wait, for the time which was spent in negotiations only served to strengthen French authority in Avignon and Venaissin. But Spain could not and would not brook any delay in the abolition of the Society of Jesus; and the Duke of Choiseul saw with a certain terror, how this one thing so occupied the Spanish diplomatists, that they forgot "England, Pitt, and the greatest and dearest interests, only to think about the Jesuits and to plague him with them." On 2nd August he sent Bernis a private letter,

¹ Despatch of 26th July. Theiner I, 343f.

² Masson, 107 and 149. Cp. above, p. 61.

³ Despatch of 9th August. Theiner I, 348f.

in which he tells him that it was said in Spain that he, the French Minister, who in his own country was counted the worst enemy of the Jesuits, was in reality one of their hangers on. Nothing in the world was really a subject of greater indifference to him than the Jesuits; but a decision must now be arrived at as soon as possible.¹ A few days later, therefore, he sent Bernis, officially, a sort of ultimatum charging the Cardinal to inform Clement XIV. that two months was the longest respite France would allow him. At the same time at an audience he made the papal nuncio at Paris feel his ill-humour—the more so because he had been freshly incited by Tanucci, who was in the highest degree offended by a work called *Reflexions on the conduct of the Bourbon Courts with reference to the Jesuits*, in which Loyola's disciples had given full vent to their anxious and wrathful hearts.

In these circumstances, Bernis found it necessary to present another note to Clement XIV., and to request a definite promise of the abolition of the order. To get out of this promise as easily as possible, Clement XIV. sent a letter written in bad French to Louis XV., in which he promised to examine the matter and then "give a proof of his fatherly love."² Louis XV. thanked him for this trivial and unsatisfactory letter; but Carlos III. could no longer contain his impatience. Certain diplomatists slandered Bernis to him, and in Madrid it was even feared that France would withdraw her support from the common cause. However, the Duke of Choiseul succeeded in convincing Carlos III. that this fear was unfounded; and Bernis regained the Spanish king's confidence to such a degree, that he was commissioned to present a new note to Clement XIV. in the name of all the Bourbon princes, with the addition of Portugal. In this note the Pope was requested, first to sanction, by means of a Bull, all that had been done with the Jesuits and their possessions in the Bourbon states; and, secondly, to inform the combined governments of the course which he intended to take in

¹ See the letter in Masson, 150f. The words are: "Rien au monde ne m'a été plus indifférent toute ma vie que les Jésuites. . . . Je les donne à tous les diables."

² A. Theiner: *Clementis XIV. Epistole et Brevia* (Paris 1852), 31, and Masson, 154f.

carrying out his former promise of abolishing the Jesuit order Clement XIV. promised to do as they wished, but again begged for time, pointing out the difficulty of the case and the hindrances that the Jesuits put in his way at every turn. Bernis wrote to Choiseul: "The Pope has occupied himself far too much in examining the depth of the ditch he has to cross; he has wasted time in tasting the medicine instead of swallowing it at once."¹ The wretched Clement grew more and more anxious as the time for deciding drew near. One day he would brace himself up with thinking of that courageous brother of his order, Sixtus V.; and the next he would be paralysed with fear by thinking of all the dangers which threatened him. Bernis wrote: "He has an intermittent fever; after a good day there always comes a bad one."

It was a great misfortune for Clement XIV. that he had not a single cardinal near him who could advise and comfort him. Once more he resolved to rid himself of his difficulties by means of a letter. He made drafts of several letters to Carlos III., but not till the 30th November did he gain enough courage to put his name to one, in which among other things he said that he was collecting some ancient documents, which in the eyes of the world would amply justify the Spanish king's wisdom in expelling the "restless and dangerous Jesuits from his country." He also said that he would very soon lay before his Spanish Majesty a plan for the total abolition of the Society of Jesus.² By this letter he crossed the Rubicon. The promise here given was as plain as could be wished, and his Catholic Majesty was a man who knew how to enforce the fulfilment of promises made to him. Choiseul, who was half surprised at this unreserved letter, wrote privately to Bernis: "If I were the Pope, I should pull this thorn out of my foot and destroy those monks, so as never to hear of them again. It would only be necessary to alter the constitution of the order a little, dress the members in white, and dedicate them to the Virgin, and then get the leaders of the order to agree to this metamorphosis. Those who wish to have the Jesuits in their states could then keep them under the name of

¹ Private letter 15th November. Masson, 160.

² The letter was written in Italian: a translation of it is found in Masson, 160.

‘Virginians’; but neither we nor the Spaniards will have them.”¹

It would doubtless have been more difficult to effect this “metamorphosis” than the Duke of Choiseul imagined, and in any case Clement XIV. did not choose to follow this course. He approved of his predecessor’s words: *Aut sint ut sunt, aut non sint*. To him the only possible plan was to effect an abolition of the hated order in accordance with all canonical rules. It seemed a sign of what was to follow that on Maundy Thursday of 1770 he omitted to have the Bull *In cæna Domini* read in St Peter’s. For several centuries, pope after pope had worked at this Bull. It had last been edited under Urban VIII. (1627). It excommunicated and cursed all heretics and schismatics, and all who without the Pope’s permission read, owned, or printed books written by people of another faith. The “Bull of Maundy Thursday” had long been an object of displeasure to statesmen, because in it the Pope encroached on the sovereign rights and self-government of states, as well as on the right of princes to judge and to punish. In France, Spain, Portugal, Naples, the Netherlands, Bohemia, and Mainz, it had long been prohibited, and in Switzerland great resentment had recently been expressed against its accusations of heresy.² When the reading of the Bull was omitted in 1770, the Jesuits fumed; but everywhere in Catholic Christendom the step was much appreciated.³ Loyola’s disciples were still more enraged when Clement XIV. made peace with Portugal, and even made Pombal’s brother a cardinal; and they were highly scandalised to hear of the splendid reception given to the papal nuncio when shortly afterwards he made his entry into Lisbon.

But in spite of the dropping of the Bull *In cæna Domini*, and the peace with Portugal, Carlos III. was not content. Why did Clement go on delaying to suppress the order?

¹ Letter of 16th January. Masson, 161.

² Theiner I, 290.

³ Although the Maundy Thursday Bull is no longer read on Maundy Thursday, Rome considers it as by no means abrogated. Pius IX., in his Constitution of 14th October 1869, renewed it in a somewhat altered form, and at the last Vatican Council he had it distributed in the second General Congregation. Shortly after, it was also posted up in the usual places at Rome for the whole Church to become acquainted with it. Döllinger: *Das Papstthum* (München 1892), 216f., 502.

In order to hasten matters Carlos III. got thirty-four of his bishops to send a letter to Rome in which they demanded the complete abolition of the Society of Jesus.¹ This combination of the Spanish episcopate had a noticeable influence in spurring Clement on. He at once took away from the Jesuits the management of the priestly seminary at Frascati. He thought of forbidding them to receive any more novices. At the end of March Bernis was able to inform Choiseul that Clement XIV. himself had told him that the brief against the Jesuits was nearly ready, and that the draft of it would be sent to the King of Spain so that he could send it on to Louis XV.; but that the brief must be kept secret until they were quite agreed about the abolition. In the end of April he wrote that Clement XIV. was dissatisfied with the style of the brief, and was occupied in altering it. Meanwhile neither Bernis nor Choiseul could understand why Carlos III. had suddenly become more patient; but, as Spain was now negotiating on her own account, Bernis received orders to remain quiet.

The reason for Carlos' patience, which at first was so mysterious, soon came to light. Bernis discovered that lively negotiations were being carried on between Madrid and Rome about another matter, which, for the time, quite eclipsed the Jesuit question. Carlos III.'s confessor had long been very eager to obtain the canonisation of the Franciscan nun, Maria of Agreda, and he had succeeded in making his royal penitent anxious for this canonisation which would confer upon Spain a new saint. Maria of Agreda, who died in 1665, lived in a convent which her mother had founded at Agreda in Old Castile. This convent was dedicated to the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin, and Maria of Agreda was an enthusiastic believer in this "pious proposition," which had long been an apple of discord among the Roman theologians. A mystical work was published in her name: *Mística Ciudad de Dios, milagro de su omnipotencia y abismo de la gracia* (Madrid 1670), containing a biography of Our Lady which gave much offence, especially in France, where the Sorbonne forbade the circulation of the book. In the days of Pope Innocent XI.,

¹ Theiner I, 531, and Masson, 163. They differ with regard to the number of the bishops.

the Inquisition likewise issued a decree against it, because it represented the Scotist doctrine of the Virgin Mary's immaculate conception as a divine revelation. It taught that the Virgin Mary's body and blood *propria specie* was present in the Eucharist, and that every 8th of December she celebrated her own *conceptio immaculata*, borne up to heaven by angels; and other similar follies. According to the visions of the Spanish nun the Virgin Mary had also helped the Apostles to compose the Apostles' creed, had visited St James at Zaragossa to command him to build a church, and so forth.¹

Such was the curious "biography," which, after several unsuccessful attempts with former popes, they now endeavoured to get recognised by the Franciscan Clement XIV. This done, it would be possible for Maria of Agreda to be crowned as a saint, and so the way be paved for the dogma of the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary, about which Carlos III. and the Spanish Franciscans were "strangely fanatical." So wrote the French ambassador at Madrid. Choiseul was beyond measure astonished that anybody in the age of Voltaire and the Encyclopædists could put faith in such romances, and at Paris it was thought that the whole thing was fraught with possible dangers. It was still fresh in remembrance what troubles had been caused by the controversy over the Bull *Unigenitus*; and now a battle was gathering about the Immaculate Conception, for it was certain that in France, where the Sorbonne had expressed the greatest contempt for the nun's work, the new dogma would never be received with submission. However, neither then nor at a later time was any decisive judgment delivered upon the fantastic imaginations of the Spanish nun. It was said in 1866 that Pius IX. had confirmed a decree of the Congregation of the Index forbidding the book; but to this day it still appears in translations and adaptations, with episcopal approbation prefixed. Indeed, Pius IX. publicly praised the learned Benedictine Dom Guéranger, for having written an apology for the work of Maria of Agreda.

The episode of Maria of Agreda shows clearly the spiritual plane upon which the battle with Jesuitism was fought, so far as Spain was concerned. Of course, the interlude came very opportunely for the disciples of Loyola, and Bernis observed

¹ Reusch : *Index* II, 253f.

that they once more lifted their heads high.¹ In the same letter in which he gave his government this information, he mentioned also that it was rumoured in Rome that the King of Spain and his confessor were beginning to feel qualms of conscience and uneasiness about giving the *coup de grace* to the Society of Jesus, and that the Spanish king wished to draw back from the combat against the Society. An extract from this confidential despatch was sent to the ambassador of France at Madrid by Choiseul, who bade him at the same time to make a discreet use of the confidential information given by the Cardinal of Albi. Whether through stupidity or through malice, the French ambassador was so inconceivably indiscreet as to send the whole extract to the Spanish Foreign Minister. This senseless or malicious step gave rise to a far from pleasant exchange of notes between France and Spain, in the course of which expressions, which were anything but diplomatic, were used on the Spanish side with regard to Cardinal Bernis, who had in reality only done his duty in keeping his government well informed about facts and opinions at Rome.²

Bernis boldly continued his work at Rome, although the prospect before him was somewhat discouraging, because the Spanish ambassador was now allowed to take the lead. The latter was exceedingly jealous of his dignity, but was not in a position to point out means for attaining the end. It was easy to nominate new cardinals, who would support the Pope, and as easy to make two of the boldest champions of the Jesuits feel the papal displeasure. "But the King of Prussia, England, and the Protestants, were agitating in earnest on behalf of the society, and at Rome it was adored." It was, in Bernis' opinion, a matter of less importance that at Vienna, likewise, people appeared to wish to make use of the Jesuits for the future; for if they were deprived of their General, their rule, and their vows, and so were converted into a congregation of priests like St Sulpice, the Austrians could easily get leave to keep and use them. But—"there was Rome in the background and Rome was entirely devoted to the Jesuits. Rome would only allow the Pope to suppress them if the see of St Peter recovered Avignon and Benevento."³

¹ Despatch of 1st August 1770. Masson, 165.

² Despatch from Grimaldi, 3rd (?) September 1770. Masson, 166.

³ Despatch from Bernis, 5th September. Masson, 162.

These last words give a short expression of Cardinal Bernis' diplomatic tactics in the case. In his opinion it was necessary to choose between the suppression of the Jesuit order and the cession of Avignon. If the one object was to be gained the other must be given up. But Choiseul wished to have both: he only thought that Carlos III. should see to the first, and Bernis to the second. At this juncture, however, circumstances arose which made it difficult for Spain to bestow as much thought upon the Jesuit question as before. A war with England was a near possibility. The danger of war passed over, and there was again a prospect of taking up the interrupted negotiations. But at last, in December 1771, Bernis was surprised by a brief intimation that the Dukes of Choiseul and of Praslin had both fallen into disgrace and were dismissed; and a little later he learned that the Duke of Aiguillon and M. de la Vrillière had taken their places.

It was a fresh piece of good news for the Jesuits.¹ The Duke of Aiguillon was so well known for a friend of theirs that the ladies of Paris were already laying wagers on the recall of the order to France,² and on 16th January Bernis informed the new Minister that the Jesuits of Rome had bidden farewell to fear, and that at the same time sure hopes were now entertained at Rome of the restoration of Avignon.³ But in spite of his sympathy with Jesuitism, the Duke of Aiguillon could not think of sacrificing Spain and the family compact at a moment so critical for France, and orders were given to La Vrillière to assure Carlos III. that Louis XV. had by no means forgotten the promise which he had made to His Catholic Majesty with regard to the Jesuits.

It was again the turn of Spain to pursue other objects, and to break off the thread of the negotiations. Carlos III.'s confessor had once more succeeded in rousing his master to be jealous for a canonisation, which this time stood in a kind of connexion with the suppression of the Jesuit order, inasmuch as it concerned the elevation of the Jesuits' ancient enemy, the

¹ In the undoubtedly correct description of the new Minister sent to Clement XIV. by his nuncio at Paris (Theiner II, 39f.) we read: "He has always passed, and still passes, for a champion of the Jesuits; whether he is so by conviction or from motives of policy must be left to the judgment of Him who searches the hearts." It can be seen from this description that a very imperfect morality was consistent with much partiality for the Jesuits.

² Theiner II, 106.

³ Masson, 176.

Mexican Juan de Palafox, who died in 1659 as Bishop of Osma.¹ Bishop Palafox, even before Pascal wrote his *Provincial Letters*, had been commissioned by the Cardinal Archbishop of Toledo to write against the Probabilism of the Jesuits; but death overtook him before he had accomplished his task. He succeeded, nevertheless, in evincing his dislike of the Society of Jesus in another way, by sending to Rome a complaint of the Jesuits' proceedings; and a papal brief of 1648 had in the main justified his view. As early as 1696 steps had been taken in Spain to get Juan de Palafox beatified, but the General of the Jesuits had hindered it. Now the matter came up again, and Rome this time was willing to meet the wishes of the Spaniards. The matter, however, was long delayed, and before the "heroic virtues" of the deceased bishop were sufficiently examined, Pius VI. stopped the process of beatification.

This breaking off of action against the Jesuits' order was not so significant as the former; still, it was a breaking off, and they began again to hope to ride out the storm. Bernis indignantly informed his government that the Roman Jesuits had begun once more to agitate for the curious "Devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus," which is one of the pet children of Jesuitism in the way of worship.² At the Colosseum, in particular, they held festivals of the Heart of Jesus, and upon an altar which was erected there was seen a picture representing Christ with His breast open; from His heart issued a multitude of Hosts, and Christ was holding one of them out to a kneeling nun, Marguerite Marie Alacoque. "The heretics and the ungodly," wrote Bernis, "make fun of these novelties; but the fanatics use them to swell the ranks of their party."

Nevertheless, Carlos III. was naturally indisposed, when it came to the point, to give up his demand for the suppression of the Society of Jesus, and his impatience once more awoke. In the new Spanish ambassador to the papal Court, Don Jose Moniño, he found the right man to bring this great and often frustrated cause to a successful issue.

Don Jose Moniño had the reputation of being an intrepid diplomatist, and a determined opponent of the Jesuits. When in 1772 he took up his situation at Rome, things were speedily

¹ Reusch: *Index* II, 494. Döllinger-Reusch: *Moralstreitigkeiten* I, 37, 669.

² Despatch of 8th May 1771. Masson, 184f.

changed.¹ Every one trembled before his energy, which was the subject of much talk. As soon as he arrived in Rome Clement XIV. caught a cold, Cardinal Bernis thought of going into the country, and Cardinal Orsini suddenly bethought him that he must visit a convent of nuns. But the Pope's cold passed off quickly; Bernis thought better of it and remained in Rome; and the negotiations began afresh. At the very first audience which Moniño had with Clement XIV. he gave the Pope to understand that Spain was determined to have the matter brought to a conclusion at once. When Clement began to speak of the difficulties, he reminded him of his promises, and added: "My master the King is a resolute prince; if too long a delay makes him distrustful, all will be lost." Clement XIV. knew of no other way of escaping for the time from more audiences than to say that he was obliged to go and take the baths; and therewith he left Rome.

While he was absent, Moniño made an accurate study of the state of things at Rome, and at the same time he attempted to intimidate the Pope's confessor, Buontempi, the only person who had any influence over Clement XIV. The cold Spanish diplomatist gave the poor Franciscan to understand that there were far worse things which could befall a favourite than to be sent home to the cloister, and that, on the other hand, it was a matter of importance to stand well with so powerful a prince as His Catholic Majesty.

At last, in August, Clement XIV. came back. At the first audience he promised Moniño to bring the beatification of Bishop Juan de Palafox to completion; but the Spanish diplomatist took no interest whatever in it. Next he expressed a willingness to close the Jesuits' noviciate and to forbid them to receive any more novices; but Moniño told him that Spain desired "suppression, not reforms." In his anguish Clement let fall some words about all the difficulties connected with the suppression of an order like the Society of Jesus. Moniño answered that he would himself with pleasure work out a scheme for the suppression of the Jesuits, if the Pope would only give him a few pieces of information for his guidance. Hoping by the acceptance of this offer to gain time, Clement agreed to it;

¹ A large part of Moniño's despatches are printed in the appendix to Saint-Priest, 290-334.

but by 6th September Bernis was able to lay before him the proposed scheme, and at the same time Carlos III. sent a letter to Louis XV., in which he expressed his deliberate conviction that there would be no peace in the kingdoms until the Society of Jesus was entirely dissolved.¹

But Rome could not, and would not, make haste. At an audience in the middle of November, Clement XIV. acknowledged that he had endeavoured to spin the case out with the intention that it might not be said that the suppression of the order was a condition of his election. These scruples made no impression upon Moniño. He answered curtly that so long a time had now gone by—three years and a half—that it would be absurd to make such an accusation. Upon this Clement made two important admissions: he confessed that on weighing the good that might result from the dissolution of the order, and the evil that would follow upon its continuance, he had come to the conclusion that it ought to be dissolved; and he admitted that not a single government had shown a disposition to maintain it.² Of taking any immediate action, however, he would not hear.

In these conditions Moniño thought that he must begin to use serious threats; and at an audience on 22nd November he went to the utmost bounds of what he could think at all permissible in dealing with a successor of St Peter.³ The stern bearing of the Spanish ambassador brought Clement to disclose the fact that he was actually engaged in composing the brief of dissolution; and he informed Moniño, in confidence, of the main outlines of what was to be contained in the preamble. Shortly after this audience Clement went still further, and commissioned a Roman prelate named Zelada to arrange in secrecy the suppression of the Society, according to the scheme drawn up by Moniño in September, and in conjunction with the Spanish diplomatist. On 6th January the work was ready, and the outcome of the joint labours of Zelada and Moniño was presented without delay to Clement. The Pope decided that the document should first be sent to Carlos III., and from him to Louis XV.,

¹ Printed, with Louis' answer, in Masson, 210.

² Despatch from Bernis to D'Aiguillon, 17th November. Theiner II, 260f.

³ Despatch from Bernis to D'Aiguillon, 24th November. Theiner II, 262.

and to the King of Portugal; and Cardinal Bernis considered the matter to be so completely finished, that he proposed to his government to give Zelada an abbacy, worth twelve or fifteen thousand francs a year, as a reward for his services.¹

A sure token of what was coming was seen in the closing of the Jesuits' famous *Collegium Romanum*; and the followers of Loyola, with a view to emergencies, now began to realise their property. In some places, as at Bologna, they even sold their church plate. On 17th February, Bernis informed his government that a copy of the papal brief had been delivered to Moniño and transmitted by him the same day to Madrid. On 5th March it was sent with the approval of Carlos III. to Louis XV., and on 14th March it was returned to the King of Spain without being examined at Versailles; if Spain was satisfied with it, France would be so too.² The Jesuits had hoped that Maria Theresa would offer remonstrances, but Choiseul had long before assured himself of the consent of Austria to the suppression of the order.

Thus all went according to the wishes of the Spaniards. But the time of procrastination was not yet quite over. The brief does not appear to have been subscribed by Clement until 8th June; and even after that was done there were still measures to be taken. Before the world could be informed of what had happened, various archives of the Jesuits had to be secured, and Clement expected that France would surrender Avignon before the brief of suppression was published, as Tanucci, in whom he had little confidence, might otherwise hesitate to relinquish his hold upon Benevento. The expectation of the surrender of Avignon cost another delay, and to set things going Moniño found it necessary to frighten the Pope's confessor again. At last, however, on 13th August a commission was appointed consisting of five cardinals, with the Dominican Padre Mamachi and a Franciscan of the strict observance as consulting theologians, and the prelate Macedonio as secretary, to settle all questions relating to the publication of the brief. This *Congregation de rebus extinctæ socie-*

¹ Letter from Bernis, 27th January 1773. Masson, 215.

² D'Aiguillon wrote, 25th January: "Si l'Espagne est contente, nous le serons, sa satisfaction étant notre seul et unique objet." Masson, 217.

tatis Jesu was bound under threat of excommunication to the deepest secrecy.¹

On Monday, 16th August, in the evening, the great secret burst. At nine o'clock that day Macedonio, accompanied by soldiers and the police for fear of a riot in the street, appeared at the Gesù, the Jesuits' chief house, to deliver to the General the fatal brief. At the same stroke of the clock other prelates read the brief to the Rectors in the other houses and colleges of the Jesuits in Rome. The followers of Loyola were forbidden until further notice to perform ecclesiastical functions, and they were not allowed to quit their dwellings. Later the same evening Cardinal Corsini, the president of the appointed Congregation, sent his carriage to fetch Lorenzo Ricci, and to drive him to the English College. Thence the General was afterwards taken to the Castle of Sant' Angelo, where he died in 1775 in a mild captivity, surrounded by his assistants. The severe treatment of Ricci was in vain defended on the ground that various seditious writings from members of the suppressed order were discovered.² The Jesuit Cordara, who thought it reasonable enough for Clement XIV. to yield to the pressure of the political powers, and suppress the Society of Jesus,³ was by no means the only person who considered it a great mistake that Ricci was not appointed to a bishopric instead of being thrown into prison.

At the cost of the Apostolic Camera, all the members of the order were supplied with the ordinary garb of priests, and after that received permission to leave their houses. Only the old and sick were detained, and the greatest consideration was shown to them on the part of the Pope. "All are agreed," writes Bernis, on 18th August, "that the Pope's decrees were conveyed to the Jesuits with great moderation and great kindness. It is also universally considered that the brief of suppression is well written, and is as lenient as possible towards the Jesuits."⁴ On this point Cordara was at one with the Cardinal of Albi.⁵

What are the contents of this famous brief *Dominus ac*

¹ The instructions for the Congregation in Theiner: *Clementis XIV. Epistolæ et Brevia*, 259f.

² Theiner II, 378, 385.

³ "Num propter Jesuitas, utique conservandæ religioni non necessarios, disperdenda quatuor Europæ amplissima regna cum parte maxima Americæ?" Cordara, 55.

⁴ Theiner II, 338.

⁵ Cordara, 62.

redemptor noster of 21st July 1773, which dissolved the mighty order of Loyola?¹

Attention is first called to the well-known decree of the Lateran Council forbidding the erection of new orders, because of the harmful confusion which too great a number of them might create in the Church of God. In spite of this decision of the Council of 1215, the Apostolic See had found it necessary in the years that followed to confirm several new orders. There were, however, in history cases of orders being suppressed. Clement V. dissolved the order of the Templars, Pius V. abolished the Humiliates, Urban VIII. extinguished the congregation of the Reformed Conventual Brethren, the orders of St Ambrose and St Barnabas, and so forth. It was not so small a list of extinguished orders that Clement XIV. was able to name in justification of the step which he intended to take. After this introduction the rise of the Society of Jesus is described, and the many complaints which from early days were made by various princes, amongst others by Philip II. of Spain, against the powerful order. The complaints began as early as the time of Paul IV., Pius V., and Sixtus V., and not even the threat of Gregory XIV. to launch the greater excommunication at those who, directly or indirectly, assailed the Society, its regulations or decrees, had been able to stay the attacks. "Day by day," says the brief, "throughout all the world, the most distressing controversies are carried on concerning the doctrines of the Society, which many consider to be at variance with right faith and good morals." In spite of all that could be done, the dislike of the Jesuits continued. "The more the outcry and the complaints against this Society made themselves heard, causing here and there dangerous commotions, contentions, and scenes of scandal, the more was the bond of charity between Christians broken, and hearts were filled with party spirit, hatred and

¹ It is printed in Theiner: *Clementis XIV. Epistolæ et Brevia*, 385-403. The document is often spoken of as a Bull, but this is incorrect. Bulls begin with the name of the Pope, without giving his number, and with the addition of *servus servorum Dei*; they are signed by the Prodatary (while Briefs are signed by the secretary for Briefs), and sealed with a seal depicting Peter and Paul—Briefs, with the Fisherman's Ring. The document of 21st July 1773, begins: "Clemens Papa XIV.," it is signed by Cardinal Negroni, the Secretary for Briefs, and it is "Datum . . . sub annulo Piscatoris." Thus it bears all the distinctive marks of a Brief. Cp. Duhr: *Jesuiten-Fabeln*, 330f.

enmity." At last the Kings of France, Spain, Portugal, and the Two Sicilies had seen themselves obliged to expel the Jesuits from their kingdoms and dominions. But not even this measure was sufficient to pacify the Christian world. Nothing less than the complete suppression of the Society was demanded.

As soon as this desire was expressed, Clement XIV. had examined into the matter. He had come to the conclusion that the Society no longer produced the rich fruits and the blessing for the sake of which it was founded. And he was of opinion that the restoration of true and lasting peace to the Church was unattainable so long as the order continued to exist. "For these weighty reasons, as well as for others, commended to us by the rules of prudence, and by regard for the good government of the Church, and kept by us in the depth of our heart, we abolish and suppress this Society of Jesus after mature consideration, in consequence of our complete understanding, and in the strength of our entire apostolic power." The brief then proceeds to forbid any expressions of opinion upon the extinction of the order, whether by word of mouth or in writing, and at the same time forbids any ridicule of the dissolved Society. Lastly, the Pontiff dismisses the notion of anyone questioning the authority of the brief "on the pretext of undue influence, obreption or subreption, nullity or invalidity, or on the ground of want of intention on our part; or by reason of any other flaw however great or important." "It shall be, and for ever remain, valid, firm, and effective; it shall retain and exercise its force fully and completely, be implicitly obeyed and entirely followed and observed by each and every person whom it concerns or in future shall concern."

Soon after the issue of this brief, which seemed to bring the epic of the Jesuits to a close for ever, Clement XIV. took his way to Castel Gandolfo, to that splendid palace where, until the time of Pius IX.'s and Leo XIII.'s "captivity" in the Vatican, the successors of St Peter sought coolness and fresh air, and where time was often shortened by a game of billiards in the beautiful room with its enchanting view over the lake of Albano lying far beneath. While Clement XIV. was there, he filled up the vacancies left in the schools and the mission field by the disappearance of the Jesuits, and on his return to Rome, he transformed the *Collegium Romanum*, where in the palmy

days of Jesuit theology Bellarmin had set up his professorial chair. It was to the disciples of Thomas and of Duns Scotus, some of whom were themselves ex-Jesuits, that the task of theological instruction was now committed. Only the disciples of Augustine were kept away from the reformed academy, in order that the transition from the dogmatics of the Jesuits might not be too abrupt.¹

Clement XIV. felt that a load was lifted off his mind when he had got so far, and the diplomatists thought he seemed in better health and spirits than before.² Carlos III. was delighted at having gained his end; and when the brief reached Lisbon, the town was illuminated for several days. Louis XV. was less pleased. He thought that the abolition might have been carried out in a more considerate manner, and without so much violence, and the award with regard to Jesuit property, which was communicated to the French government by the Congregation, left a sting behind; because, as far as France was concerned, the thing had been settled long ago in a different way. Inasmuch as a great part of the brief was not of real interest to France, where the order was virtually suppressed in 1764, Louis XV. resolved not to register it, but only to make it officially known to the bishops. It was also exceedingly distressing to Louis XV. that it now became necessary to take steps with regard to the restitution of Avignon. It is true that D'Aiguillon had dissolved Parliament in 1771, and put the *Grand Conseil* in its place, so that there was no fear of parliamentary opposition. But the members of Parliament were still alive, and they and their Gallican sympathisers would view with anger the restoration of Avignon and Venaissin to the see of St Peter.

Among the Parisians, moreover, a certain reaction could also be felt with regard to the Jesuit question itself. Many were surprised at the papal brief, because they had imagined that when it came to the point, Clement XIV. would not have the courage to abolish an order approved by the Council of Trent. Louis XV.'s daughter, Mme. Louise, who had taken the veil in the Carmelite convent at Saint Denis, was especially eager in the Jesuit cause. She made use of various intrigues to make her royal father beg for the restoration of

¹ Theiner II, 380.

² Bernis, in a despatch of 3rd November 1773. Saint-Priest, 145.

the Jesuit order in his country.¹ She showed her love for the suppressed order by plaguing D'Aiguillon and Bernis with her requests for Jesuit relics. Now it was the cross and candlesticks which had stood on the high altar of the church of the *Collegium Romanum*; now other objects which had belonged to the Jesuits. She and Archbishop de Beaumont put their heads together to work for the Society of Jesus, and several circumstances seemed to favour their wishes. Many Frenchmen, even followers of the *esprit philosophique*, pitied the Jesuits because of the persecution they had suffered. They were missed in the schools; and when Louis XV. sat in his chapel, weighed down by his many sins, one or two preachers dared to blame him for having given his consent to that which had befallen the Society of Jesus. On St Francis Xavier's day, 1773, an ex-Jesuit preached a sermon in Paris, in which, among other things, he said that his hearers had presumably come there to weep over what had happened, and he spoke so disrespectfully of Clement XIV. that the papal nuncio had to take the matter up.² D'Aiguillon even began to prepare a royal edict permitting those Jesuits who were expelled by order of Parliament to return and seek appointments in the French Church, but only on the understanding that they submitted to the brief *Dominus ac redemptor noster*.

There were one or two things, however, which indicated that not all Jesuits would bow to this brief. From Rome came vague rumours of serious defiance on the part of the Jesuits, and even of the General himself; and both Frederick II. and Catherine II. refused to enforce the brief in their countries. Frederick II. found the Jesuits useful in Silesia, and Catherine II. needed their help in White Russia. Accordingly the Silesian Jesuits were provided with a vicar-general to take the place of Ricci. The doings of the Prussian king made a painful impression at Rome, and Clement XIV. begged Austria to induce Frederick to submit to the brief.³

Both Frederick II. and Catherine II. refused to carry out the Pope's wishes, giving as the reason their solemn promise in the treaty of 18th September 1773, to let the Roman Catholic Church remain in *statu quo* in their newly acquired Polish territory. In their opinion this included the maintenance of

¹ Masson, 240f.² Theiner II, 468f.³ Masson, 254.

the Society of Jesus, although the Pope had actually abolished the order before the treaty was concluded. Nevertheless, as far as Frederick II. is concerned, we have words of his which show that in reality he had a very poor opinion of the learning of the Jesuits, and of their teaching powers.¹

The ex-Jesuit, Francis Xavier Feller, sounded the alarm all over Germany, by writing poisoned articles against Clement XIV. in the German papers, and also in those of Holland and Belgium.² It was common in Jesuit circles to accuse the Pope of simony. It was asserted that he had undertaken before his election to abolish the order, and so had bought the tiara by his promise to carry out the wishes of the Bourbon Courts. The learned Italian Jesuit, Zaccaria, ventured to use very bold expressions in the immediate neighbourhood of the Pope.³ A myth was formed, to the effect that Clement XIV. had signed the brief with a pencil, at night, in one of the windows of the Quirinal, had fainted immediately after signing, and had lain on the marble floor till the morning. On being carried to bed he had cried again and again: "Oh God, I am damned! Hell is my home! There is no salvation for me now!" These stories, which belong to the same class as the Jesuit fables about the Jansenist meeting at Bourfontaine,⁴ and about Luther's suicide, have been brought to light again in our times by Crétineau-Joly and polemical Jesuits of lesser importance. They are founded on some autograph notes by the Jesuit Bolgeni, now preserved in the archives of the Jesuit General at Rome.⁵ Bolgeni gives Cardinal de Simone as his authority; but on closer examination the untrustworthiness of Bolgeni's notes is so apparent, that they have only been believed in those quarters where the wish exists to lower Clement XIV.'s character and work at any cost.

But it is certain that the opposition to the brief made an impression on the infirm and anxious Pope. For a moment it seemed that Madame Louise's intrigues would succeed in France. D'Aiguillon sent to Bernis a "plan for forming a congregation in France for the employment of the former

¹ Theiner II, 400f.

² *Ibid.*, 391f.

³ *Ibid.*, 487f.

⁴ See Reusch: *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Jesuitenordens*, 120f.

⁵ They are printed in Theiner: *Clementis XIV. Epistolæ et Brevia*, 371f.

Jesuits";¹ which was nothing less than a re-establishment of the order with a special *supérieur général* for France. Thus the Jesuits and their friends now desired the very arrangement, which at the beginning of the negotiations they had rejected with scorn.²

There was one great obstacle to the accomplishment of this plan; it would constitute a grave offence both to Carlos III. and to the Pope. Consideration for the latter probably did not weigh very much, but to offend his Spanish Majesty so deeply was a more serious thing. The plan was quietly put aside. Meanwhile affairs in France became so threatening that Clement XIV. was constrained to issue a fresh brief (9th March 1774), addressed to Bernis, in which he charged him to labour to have the brief *Dominus ac redemptor noster* completely carried out.³ When the Cardinal of Albi sent the new brief to D'Aiguillon, it was accompanied by an explicit note, in which the writer proved that it was the Pope's will that the order should never again appear.⁴ He characterised as false and foolish the assertion that Clement XIV. was secretly a friend of the Jesuits, and that as soon as he had satisfied the sovereigns, he would be glad enough to have the Society restored. On the contrary, it was only fear of hurting the Roman Catholics in Prussia and Russia which kept the Pope from launching ex-communications against those who dared to resist his clearly expressed will. D'Aiguillon did not think it expedient to make this note known to all the French bishops. He gave Madame Louise something else to occupy her thoughts; the Jesuits had to be put off; and the death of Louis XV. (10th May 1774) soon dashed the hopes of all the French friends of the Jesuits. Soon after the accession of the new King, D'Aiguillon, who owed his elevation to Madame du Barry, was compelled to retire; and under the new *régime* the restoration of Parliament was immediately talked of. Forty French bishops attempted in vain to frighten the young King from taking this step, by representing to him how dangerous it might be to the Church. On 12th November 1774 Louis XVI. held a *lit de justice*, and

¹ It was published for the first time by Masson, 251f.

² See above, p. 45.

³ Printed in Theiner: *Clementis XIV. Epistolæ et Brevia*, 297f.

⁴ Masson, 259f.

reinstated the members of Parliament in the possession of those functions of which in his opinion they ought never to have been deprived.¹

By that time Clement XIV. was dead. The difficulties about the restoration of Avignon and Benevento, and the French designs for re-establishing the suppressed order, had filled him with new cares and troubles, and every anxiety told upon his bodily health. After Holy Week in 1774 he became more infirm, and the diplomatists already began to prepare for another Conclave. Bernis wrote to his government, after an audience on 16th August, that Clement XIV. had become very thin and old, so that he feared the disease had gone below the surface.² The Pope's enemies had spread the report that he had gone out of his mind, and as this rumour had also reached Paris, Bernis thought it right to contradict it. On 7th September he wrote: "In spite of whatever malicious men have dared to say, the Pope's mind is as sound and his head as clear as ever. During the last week he has received not only his own Ministers, but the foreign representatives."³

The disease took its course, and fear of the Jesuits caused the sick Pope fresh pangs. Only up at Castel Gandolfo did he feel safe and happy. In Rome he was in constant dread of Jesuit poison and Jesuit daggers; and the prophecies of his quickly approaching death, which were now and then circulated among the people, increased his alarm. At Christmas, 1773, there were riots in the streets of Rome; and although they were quelled with comparative ease, Clement XIV. felt that the shouts of joy with which the Roman people greeted his appearance in the streets became less frequent and less loud.

The end came on 22nd September 1774. Bernis wrote to his government on 28th September: "You will already have heard that the Pope died last Thursday at eight in the morning; he retained his mental faculties to the last."⁴ The body was so wasted with long sickness and evil humours, that decomposition set in at once, and the customary exhibition on the *lit de parade* had to be dispensed with. This circumstance

¹ P. de Crousaz-Crétet: *L'église et l'état au XVIII^e siècle* (Paris, 1893), 252f.

² Bernis to Vergennes, 17th August 1774; Theiner II, 508; Masson, 286.

³ Theiner II, 512.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 515; Masson, 293.

strengthened the report that he had been poisoned, which gained more and more credence. Cardinal Bernis believed this report;¹ Don Jose Moniño was inclined to do the same; and M. Béranger, the French *chargé d'affaires* at Naples, even wrote that "Padre Parisi, the Franciscan, who was with the Pope during his last moments, writes to his friend the Chevalier Bottola, that the General of the order has admitted, under the seal of confession, that he gave orders to poison the Pope, and said by whom the poison was administered."² It was stated that the poison was *acquetta*. According to some, Clement XIV. had received it in the Holy Eucharist; according to others he had eaten poisoned figs.

In confutation of this report, we are reminded that the evidence of the confessor, of the doctors, and of many other contemporaries, all points to the belief that Clement XIV. died a natural death.³ Cordara dismisses the report as a piece of absurdity which is not worth wasting words upon.⁴ Others have asked: In whose interest would it have been to poison the Pope at such a time?⁵ Cordara says that the Jesuits were not so silly as to commit such a crime so late, when their order had been suppressed and everything settled, if they ventured to do it at all. On the same side Baron C. H. Gleichen, who was for a time in the Danish diplomatic service, is thought to have expressed the truth when he wrote: "Clement XIV. died from fear of dying. Poison was his one idea; and the sudden decomposition of his body was only the result of the horrible fright which killed him. I am convinced that the Jesuits would still be in existence, if they had been as bad as was supposed."⁶ When the evidence of well-informed men is so sharply contradictory, it seems best for history to hold her verdict in suspense, admitting that on the basis of our present means of knowledge, it is impossible to

¹ Masson, 293. Saint-Priest likewise believes in the poisoning; *op. cit.* 150f.

² Masson, 294.

³ So Theiner II, 518, and [A. von Reumont:] *Ganganelli: seine Briefe und seine Zeit* (Berlin 1847) 70f. The latter writer has since declared (*Aus König Friedrich Wilhelms IV. gesunden und kranken Tagen*, Leipzig 1885, 291) that he is now inclined to see many things in a different light; but whether this retraction extends to the question how Clement XIV. died, is not stated.

⁴ Döllinger: *Beiträge* III, 59.

⁵ So Masson, 296f.

⁶ *Souvenirs de Ch. H. Baron de Gleichen*, par P. Grimblot (Paris 1868), 33. Baron Gleichen died in 1807.

decide how far the report that Clement XIV. was poisoned was a true report.¹

There is no doubt, however, that the suppression of the Jesuit order was an event of world-wide importance. This powerful society, which had ruled princes and statesmen through the confessional, and the rising generation through the schools, had used its influence to support the system of the Curia, and by all means in its power to annul the effects of the Reformation. When it was suppressed, the mediæval theory of the State lost its best support, and the Reformation its fiercest foe. It was the political sins of the Jesuits which roused the anger of the Bourbons; therefore it was just that they should be overthrown for political reasons. Their fall was the only real fruit of the Bourbon family treaty. But political winds are apt to turn. The day might come when politicians, and those who regard things in a political light, might wish to see Loyola's order restored, because they needed it to head, not only the Counter-Reformation, but also the Counter-Revolution. Such a day would perhaps never have come, had the abolition of the order been the result of religious and moral indignation at those things in Jesuitism, which must be said to conflict with real religion and true morality.

¹ This is the opinion of M. Brosch : *Geschichte des Kirchenstaates* (Gotha 1882) II, 143.

CHAPTER IV

ALFONSO MARIA DE' LIGUORI

DURING the time that the ghost of Jesuitism was disembodied, it found refuge in an order founded by an Italian, who has not only been canonised, but also honoured, with the title of *Doctor ecclesiæ*.

If we can believe the records of a process of beatification, a wonderful miracle took place in the little episcopal city of Sant' Agata dei Goti, between Benevento and Caserta, on that 21st of September when Clement XIV. was in his last agony. Alfonso Liguori, the Bishop of the place, who was seventy-eight years old, fell into a trance while resting in his easy chair after Mass. He neither moved nor spoke, and was insensible to everything about him. The whole of that day and the following night he remained thus, and no one dared to rouse him from his state of holy ecstasy. But at dawn the next day he rang his bell, as a sign that he wished to say Mass as usual. When he saw the astonished faces of the members of his household, he asked: "What is the matter?" They told him how long he had sat without giving any sign of life. "That is true," he answered, "but you do not know that I have been with the Pope, who is now dead." Those who surrounded him at first believed that the Bishop had had a dream. Later on they found that he had returned to consciousness of his surroundings at the very moment that Clement XIV. died at Rome.¹ They concluded that this was an instance of the phenomenon familiar in the legends of the Saints, called "bilocation," when a man is permitted to be in two places at once.² It is said that this was not the only

¹ A. Capecehatro : *La vita di Sant' A. M. de' Liguori* (Roma 1893) II, 269, following a contemporary, Padre Tannoia, and the Process of the Beatification.

Görres : *Die christliche Mystik* (Regensburg 1837) II, 580f.

"bilocation" which the Bishop of St Agata experienced. Once, while staying at Amalfi, he is said to have preached in the church there, and at the same moment to have been hearing a confession in his house at home; and once, while at Naples, he gave alms to a poor woman at Nocera de' Pagani.

Alfonso Maria de' Liguori, the subject of these stories, which are still repeated even by a cardinal-archbishop and librarian to the Pope,¹ was born 27th September 1696 at Marianella, one of the suburbs of Naples. His father, Giuseppe de' Liguori, was a captain of the galleys; his mother, Anna Cavalieri, was of Spanish extraction on the mother's side. His mother's predilection for the Spanish Saint Alfonso of Toledo provided him with his first Christian name, and the family veneration for the Madonna gave him his second. This name was prophetic, for never since the Middle Ages has the Virgin Mary had a more true knight than the Bishop of Sant' Agata.

As Alfonso Maria's father was often away on the galleys, his education was at first principally left to his pious mother. His first instruction he received from the fathers of the Oratory; and in this congregation, so well known in the history of music, young Liguori's taste for music and for poetry was fostered. He had inherited the harp of Giacomone of Todi. He began early as a *Laudese*, and a duet between the Soul and Jesus Christ, arranged for the violin, of which both the words and music are his, has lately been brought to light in the British Museum.²

His parents had not intended the young *Lauda* composer for the service of the Church. With his good looks, his large head, high forehead, aquiline nose, and speaking eyes, they expected him to make his fortune in other ways. When he was twenty-one years old, the parents on both sides arranged a marriage between him and the beautiful Teresa, aged fourteen, the only daughter of Francesco Liguori, Prince of Presiccio. But when the Princess of Presiccio soon after gave birth to a son, the engagement was broken off, because, as the cardinal biographer says, "Teresina would now lose

¹ A. Capecelatro was made Archbishop of Capua in 1880, and Cardinal in 1885, and Head Librarian to the Pope.

² Capecelatro I, 33.

her dowry — a thing which even Christians think a great deal too much of in the question of marriage." Teresina's brother did not live long, and after his death the former marriage project came up again. Now, however, Teresina was unwilling. Her heart was set upon the cloister, and within the convent walls she met an early death. Thirty-seven years later her former betrothed, then an elderly priest, wrote an account of her life of piety and her edifying death. It does not mention that her biographer had once regarded his subject with earthly love. It may, however, have been from association with the love of his youth that the pious priest and bishop so often resorts to the intercession of St Teresa. *Sia lodato Gesù, Giuseppe e Maria, con S. Teresa in compagnia!* So runs the heading of the first letter in that collection of many volumes of correspondence, which Liguori's disciples have lately published;¹ and Teresina's saintly namesake is put in a place of honour in the heading of many of Liguori's letters, next to Jesus, Mary, and Joseph.

A proposed marriage with another rich heiress was coldly declined by Alfonso. He also had made up his mind to live unmarried, and he gave himself up wholly to his work as an advocate. But a sensible wound to his vanity gave him a distaste for that work. An important case, which he had hoped to win, was lost, because in an important part of the papers he had overlooked the little word *non*. This misfortune made such an impression upon him that he sat silent for three days without taking food, and after that decided to break with the false world. With prayer he laid down his advocate's sword before an image of the Virgin, just as Loyola at Montserrat had laid his weapons at the feet of the Madonna. After a very short period of theological study, Alfonso, in 1725, was ordained sub-deacon—the first step on the priestly ladder.

As a priest, Liguori determined to imitate the Saint of the Oratory, Philip Neri. He immediately began to work among the *Lazzaroni* in Naples, and in the evenings he gathered round him men of every grade of society for spiritual conversation. In the open places in Naples he often made stirring addresses to casual listeners, and when the bells rang

¹ *Lettere di S. Alfonso Maria de' Liguori* (Roma 1887) I, 1.

for *Ave Maria*, he and his friends at many of the churches invited young and old to come in for prayer and for instruction in the rules of a Christian life. He also tried his spiritual powers outside Naples. When an earthquake had brought distress and misery upon Foggia, a thing happened while he was preaching in the church of St John the Baptist in that town, which he and others took as a sign that he was under the Madonna's special protection. During his preaching, a famous and ancient effigy of the Virgin became alive and moved, much to the amazement of the congregation, who with loud shouts and tears commended themselves to the Mother of God.¹

Liguori also worked for a time at Amalfi, and had there an experience of no less importance than the one at Foggia. A visionary nun, Sister Maria Celeste Costarosa, had a vision, in which she saw a number of priests gathered together for love of God, and preaching to millions of neglected souls in villages and country districts. Liguori was one of these priests, and it seemed to Sister Maria that God said: "I have chosen Alfonso to be the leader of the new congregation of priests which shall prosper in honour of Me!"

The words of the visionary woman fell into good ground in Liguori's mind. In 1732, he, with eleven others, began a mission in the little town of Scala, in the province of Benevento, among the numerous cowherds and goatherds in the neighbourhood. The Bishop of Scala gave him and his friends a dwelling-place in a poor monastic building; and in the cathedral of Scala, after a Mass of the Holy Ghost and a *Te Deum*, the new congregation was formed; the Saviour (*Salvator*) being chosen as patron.² But in Naples there arose a jealousy of the new order. The Congregation of the Propaganda raised objections; they even thought of depriving Liguori of his humble living, and in March 1733 nearly everyone deserted him. But he was firmly resolved to sacrifice himself altogether on behalf of the poorest and the most neglected, and his courage rose again when the Bishop of Cajazzo gave him an ancient hermitage in the village of

¹ Liguori's own account given to the Bishop of Foggia, and written in 1777, is found in *Lettere* II, 456f.

² Capecelatro I, 164f.

Schiavi (*Sclavia*). It would doubtless have made him still more hopeful if he had known, what the Cardinal of Capua believes to be a fact, that the asylum which received him was the same place where the great schoolman, Anselm of Canterbury, wrote part of his famous treatise *Cur Deus homo*.¹

Later on, Liguori obtained new houses for his congregation in Ciorani and Nocera de' Pagani, and began spiritual exercises after the manner of the Jesuits, with those who gave themselves up to his guidance. But the old antagonism between the priests and the congregations made itself felt here again, and the *Alfonsini* had to suffer somewhat from the opposition of the clergy. A complaint was lodged against him at Rome, and he was accused of wishing to form a new order without the Pope's permission. He replied that most of the orders had been formed with only the bishop's permission at first, and that the Pope had established them afterwards, and that, of course, he wished to have the work he had begun acknowledged, not only by the see of St Peter, but by his King as well.²

There was much to be done, however, before this end could be reached; for Rome was somewhat slow to authorise new orders. Liguori determined to labour as an apostle of the written word as well as of the spoken, and in 1744 he began his work as an author with a little book on the Sacrament and *Maria Santissima*. He continually emphasises the fact that this work and the numerous others from his hand owe their origin, not to the vain desire of making a name, but to zeal for the honour of God and for Christian truth.³ His writing was to be an "Apostolate," and he used his pen so industriously that his works in the Regensburg edition fill two and forty volumes.

After some years had passed, and the congregation was no longer in its infancy, Liguori resolved to attempt to get it acknowledged by the Pope and by the King. Benedict XIV. had all the circumstances examined, and on 23rd February 1749 the new order was confirmed. Liguori had written

¹ Capecelatro I, 187.

² *Ibid.*, 236f.

³ *Lettere* III, 274, 56, 216, and many other places, especially in the letters to his publisher, Remondini, at Venice.

letters to Benedict XIV. and the Cardinal-Archbishop of Naples explaining his programme as the founder of the order.¹ The congregation was to consist of priests who lived together under the supervision of the local bishop, like the "Fathers of the Mission" and the so-called *Pii Operai*. The members were always to choose their dwellings in the poorest neighbourhoods, and to devote themselves especially to the neglected shepherds and other equally ignorant and helpless people. They should also be willing to take part in missions, in the work of instruction, and in the administration of the Sacraments—in fact to be a sort of home missionaries in priests' orders. This project was approved by Benedict XIV.; but with reference to the name of the new congregation an alteration was made at Rome. Liguori had wished to call his order the Congregation of St Saviour; but as there was already a company of Canons Regular at Venice which bore that name, his order was called after *Christus Redemptor*. Liguori was then solemnly acknowledged as *Rector Major* of the "Redemptorists." After the papal ratification many new members applied for admission, although the full leave (*exequatur*) of the Crown was not obtained till a much later date.² The King, however, had shown his sympathy with Liguori's work by giving him an annual pension before Benedict XIV. confirmed the order.³

Liguori was convinced that the happy execution of his plan was due first of all to the Madonna. In token of his gratitude he wrote the most widely read of his devotional books, *Le glorie di Maria Vergine*, a full-voiced utterance of the most modern cultus of Mary, and at the same time a collection of highly-coloured flowers gathered with something more than *naïveté* from the field of the more ancient Marialogy. Before that time, in 1748, Liguori had published the first edition of his chief work, the *Theologia Moralis*,⁴ at which he had been labouring for fifteen years, and which he kept on improving to the last. These two books, like all his writings, grew out of

¹ *Lettere* I, 149f., 154f.

² With regard to the difficulties connected with this, see *Lettere* I, 205, 237, 240, 350f., 379.

³ *Lettere* I, 150.

⁴ The dedication (to the Archbishop of Conza) and the preface to the first edition are printed in the *Lettere* III, 3f.

his practical work. The book in praise of the Madonna gave expression to that heartfelt affiance in her, which stamped his whole religious life; his *Moral Theology* was the fruit, not only of long years of study bestowed upon the subject, but also of his work in the confessional, and of his efforts to make the Neapolitan shepherds submit to the law of Christ.

In 1747 the King offered him the archbishopric of Palermo,¹ but he did not accept the offer, because he wished to devote himself wholly to the congregation, which at that time had not yet received the Pope's confirmation. Fifteen years later came a new offer, this time of the bishopric of Sant' Agata dei Goti; a diocese which contained about 30,000 souls, with a yearly income of more than 11,000 *lire*, a considerable sum as things went at that time.² He would rather have declined this also; but orders came from Rome to accept it, and according to the rule of the Redemptorists he was obliged to comply.³ But Liguori was never quite happy as a bishop. The consecration at Rome with all its ceremonies and big gratuities scandalised him at the outset and landed him besides in money difficulties; and in 1765 he was so tired that he begged to be relieved of the burden of the bishopric.⁴ Not until 1775 was he allowed to resign. At that time he had for several years suffered from constant pains in his head and chest, and was deaf and nearly blind. Four times during his episcopate he had taken the *Viaticum* and twice received Extreme Unction.⁵ Rheumatism had so crippled him that his head had sunk right down upon his breast, and it was only by means of special arrangements that he was able to drink of the cup at Mass. Seen from behind he looked like a headless trunk.

Even while Bishop of Sant' Agata, he had been Rector-Major of the Redemptorists, but not until after the resignation of his see could he again give himself wholly to his congregation. He settled at Nocera de' Pagani, and from thence, with the help of younger and stronger men, he ruled, amidst increasing feebleness of body, the steadily growing troop of the Redemptorists. But it was not without much opposition and many disappoint-

¹ *Lettere* I, 136f.

² Capecelatro II, 3.

³ *Lettere* I, 469.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 554f.

⁵ *Ibid.* II, 341f. The application to Pius VI. for leave to retire.

ments.¹ He saw with sorrow how the spirit of disobedience spread within his order, and the opposition to it grew so strong that at one time there was a talk of dissolving the order or reconstructing it altogether.² It also distressed Liguori that the Neapolitan State delayed so long in acknowledging the Redemptorists. The first step towards this recognition was taken in 1779, and two Redemptorists were sent to Naples to negotiate the matter. Their instructions were not to yield a jot or tittle of the rule that had been confirmed at Rome. These instructions were transgressed, and the *Regolamento*, which was the outcome of the negotiations with the Neapolitan government, would have put the order completely at the mercy of the secular powers.³ The blind old Founder of the order was made to believe that the new rules agreed with the old, and acting on the advice of his confessor and others he signed the *Regolamento*. He soon discovered that he had been deceived; but nevertheless he ordered the publication of the new rule, after the government had agreed to some small, unimportant alterations. He was convinced that it was necessary to yield outwardly to the King's demands; for instance, that the promises ought to be exchanged for an oath of obedience, because the King did not like promises.⁴

Those of the Redemptorists, however, who lived in the Papal States complained to the see of St Peter; and at Rome they would not hear of any temporal government altering a rule confirmed by the Pope. It was lost labour that Liguori endeavoured to show that the rule and the *Regolamento* agreed on all vital points.⁵ The Roman commission, which was appointed to examine the case, said that Liguori's behaviour was quite incomprehensible. "It is impossible," says a letter to him from Rome, "that a man of your wisdom and learning should allow himself to be led into using secret reservations, which are contrary to the principles of healthy morality, or should flatter himself that he can appear what he is not, and can be something other than he seems."⁶ The result of the

¹ Capecelatro II, 342f.

² *Lettere* III, 469.; Capecelatro II, 348f.

³ *Lettere* II, 518f.; Capecelatro II, 451f. Döllinger and Reusch: *Geschichte der Moralstreitigkeiten* (Nördlingen 1889) I, 362f., following a monograph of Dilgskron, which is unknown to me.

⁴ *Lettere* II, 535.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 539f.

⁶ Döllinger-Reusch I, 364.

new *Regolamento* was a complete schism. On 22nd September 1770 Pius VI. appointed a new superintendent over the four Redemptorist houses in the Papal States, and the Neapolitan houses were shut out of the congregation and deprived of the enjoyment of its privileges and favours.¹

By this means, Liguori and those Redemptorists, who wished with him to follow the new rule, were put out of the order. This was, of course, a heavy blow to the old man. In several letters to the new superintendent of the Redemptorists in the Papal States he endeavoured to effect a compromise, permitting the Neapolitan Redemptorists to follow the rule approved by the King, and those in the Papal States that of the Pope. No concession was to be expected on the part of the King.² Liguori wrote a letter to Pius VI.; but it was not well received.³ "I know," Pius is said to have exclaimed, "that Alfonso is a saint, and has always been devoted to the Roman See; but in this matter he has not shown himself so."⁴

Liguori bore in silence the displeasure of Pius VI. at his having in the matter of the congregation followed the temporal power rather than the see of Peter, and when anyone asked his advice he always answered: "Obey the Pope!" Not till three years after his death, which occurred 1st August 1787, did the King of the Two Sicilies revoke the *Regolamento*, and then the Neapolitan Redemptorists were again received into the order. But before Liguori closed his eyes he had the joy of seeing his order send a branch far into the North. In 1783 Clemens Maria Hoffbauer from Moravia, and Johann Hübel from Bohemia, entered the congregation at Rome, and after a while they began to hold missions in one of the churches in Warsaw.⁵ A little later the Redemptorists came to Southern Germany and Switzerland; and in 1812 Hoffbauer himself, instigated by Adam Müller, began a work in Vienna, which prospered greatly under the ecclesiastical reaction which followed the Congress of Vienna; Zacharias Werner, the famous preacher of the Congress, even found shelter for

¹ *Lettere* II, 557f. "E cessato con ciò" [*i.e.*, by the adoption of the *Regolamento*, which is described as *un nuovo sistema*], "di esser membra di detta congregazione e di godere di tutte le prerogative e grazie."

² "Il Rè non si rimuove mai dal suo sistema." *Lettere* II, 569.

³ *Lettere* II, 572f.

⁴ Döllinger-Reusch I, 365.

⁵ Seb. Brunner: *Cl. Maria Hoffbauer und seine Zeit* (Wien 1858), 29f.

a time in the tents of the Liguorians. In the next generation Liguori's order came into Portugal, France, Belgium, Holland, Prussia, Russia, Turkey, England, and North America; in our days Baltimore is a main centre of its activity.¹ Where Loyola's disciples have had full liberty to spread their wings, Liguori's are generally of less importance, but where this has not been the case, or where, as now in Germany, the Jesuits are excluded, there the Redemptorists have in many ways been their substitutes.

There is considerable likeness between the two orders in important points, and Liguori, the Neapolitan, has in several respects been the disciple of Loyola the Basque. With an intuitive perception that the Redemptorist order is altogether of the same spirit as their own, the Jesuits have been very eager to obtain for Liguori all the honours that the Church of Rome could bestow. Immediately after his death a preliminary enquiry into his "virtues and miracles" was begun at Nocera de' Pagani and Sant' Agata dei Goti, with a view to his being ultimately beatified. There were, however, a few incidents in his life which required to be cleared up before such an honour could be obtained. In 1772 Liguori had written a long dedication of his book, *Trionfo della Chiesa*, to Tanucci, the powerful Neapolitan Minister, who was one of the most ardent "Regalists" of his time.² The friendly words which Liguori addressed to Tanucci in this dedication shocked many people. However, they comforted themselves with the thought that it was "only a dedication"; that Tanucci had not personally broken with Christianity; and also that even such a holy man as Francis of Sales had looked upon flattery with indulgence, and had attributed to it an "indirect" educational importance.³ The schism within the order, and Liguori's own attitude towards the rule, might likewise be the cause of certain difficulties to the *Promotor fidei* in the course of a process of beatification. In order to stifle such questions Pius VI., after a careful

¹ Capecelatro II, 569f.

² Printed in the *Lettere* III, 400f.

³ Cardinal Villecourt says on this subject: "La civilité, suivant la doctrine de Saint François de Sales, permet quelques paroles flatteuses à l'égard de ceux, qui en méritent le moins: elles sont alors une leçon indirecte, afin qu'ils songent à s'en rendre dignes" (Capecelatro II, 264). It is easily understood how Newman's Teutonic seriousness rose up against such Latin ethics.

investigation of the circumstances, issued a brief commanding eternal silence upon this delicate point.¹ So the trial took its course, and in 1803 appeared an official declaration that there was nothing in Liguori's writings contrary to the faith (*nihil censura dignum*). After this declaration Pius VII. gave a dispensation from the rule that fifty years must elapse between a man's death and the examination of his "virtues"; and when the Jesuit order was risen from the grave which policy had dug for it, Pius VII. (on 15th September 1816) placed Alfonso Maria de' Liguori among the number of the beatified.

Only two years later the first steps were taken towards obtaining a place for the Bishop of Sant' Agata on the roll of Saints, but it was not until 1839 that Gregory XVI. issued the Bull of Canonisation, advancing Liguori to the company of the Saints of the Church, because of his virtues and his miracles. Two instances of miraculous healing are especially brought forward.² But Liguori had not yet reached the greatest honour of all. In 1867, 39 cardinals, 10 patriarchs, 135 archbishops, 544 bishops, 25 heads of orders, and 4 theological faculties—among them those of Louvain and Vienna—besought Pius IX. to grant to St Alfonso Maria Liguori the honourable title of "Doctor of the Church," which placed him side by side with divines like Augustine, Bernard of Clairvaux, Thomas Aquinas and Bonaventura. It was in reality the army of Jesuitism which came forward with this request; and it was granted by a papal decree of 23rd March 1871.³

Next to Liguori's war with infidelity and Jansenism, the decree lays especial stress upon three things which make him worthy to be a *doctor ecclesiæ*. They are his setting forth of ethical principles, and his zeal for spreading the belief in the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary, and in the infallibility of the Pope. These are also the three main points upon which Leo XIII. lays stress in the letter which he wrote on 28th August 1879 to Liguori's French translators.⁴ A closer study of his ethics, of his glorification of the Virgin, and of his doctrine of papal infallibility, will make it easy

¹ The brief is to be found in the *Lettere* II, 558f.

² Bull of Canonisation, in *Capecelatro* II, 582-593.

³ Printed in *Capecelatro* II, 594-596.

⁴ *Leonis Papæ XIII. Allocutiones, Epistolæ, Constitutiones* (Brügge 1887) I, 109f.

to understand why modern Jesuitism has been so eager for his exaltation.

In the decree above mentioned, Pius IX. says, by way of specifying more distinctly Liguori's importance in the domain of morals, that he "has thrown light upon what was obscure, has cleared up what was doubtful, and has made a safe way between the perplexed opinions of theologians, which were sometimes lax and sometimes rigorous."¹ This refers to Liguori's solution of one of the ethical problems which have filled an important place since the rise of Jesuitism. But in order to understand Liguori's position in the theory of ethics, we must first consider his own ethical personality.

The papers of the process of beatification expatiate at great length upon his many "heroic virtues." He was one of the heroes of that monastic asceticism of which the only object is to make life as unpleasant and burdensome to itself as possible. At Ciorani he lived for years at the back of a staircase in a wretched, narrow room, which received light and air only through an opening covered with paper dipped in oil and wax, instead of glass. In order to make every step painful he often carried pebbles in his shoes; and when he was going to eat he generally hung a big stone round his neck. Three days a week he ate nothing but a thin soup and bread; when he had fish, he contented himself with the scanty pickings about the head. Every time he took his frugal meal, he had a box of bitter herbs by him, which he sprinkled over his food, so that both taste and smell was repulsive. Before eating sweet fruits he made them unpalatable by putting salt or bitter herbs upon them; and neither the beggars, nor the cats, which were always about him, would touch his food. He never slept more than five hours, and he often spread his sheet over sharp stones, which went so deep into him that the blood spurted out upon the wall. In the daytime it was his rule to wear a penitent's belt, garnished with spikes; and both night and day he plied the scourge upon his feeble body. Like other saints, however, both male and female, he seems to have had a weakness, if such it may be called: his weakness was for snuff. It is said that this point was alleged by the *Advocatus diaboli* during the process of

¹ "Cum inter implexas theologorum sive laxiores sive rigidiore sententias tutam straverit viam."

beatification, but was dismissed with the remark, that Liguori took snuff by the doctor's orders, as a remedy for an affection of the eyes.¹ It is certain that his confessor gave him the testimony that he never had "matter" for a confession. Yet what was the spiritual condition of this saint?

He was continually plagued by scruples, which brought him to the verge of insanity. His letters give a forcible impression of the incredible suffering to which his scrupulous conscience subjected him. The further he advanced in asceticism, the stronger his temptations became. He always turned his back when talking to women; but, as a feeble old man, he acknowledged that he could not walk down a street without casting his eyes downwards so that they might not meet any temptation to impurity.² In order to conquer his scruples, he made himself a perfect tool in the hands of his spiritual guide. No Jesuit could have been more willing to sacrifice his will than Liguori; and he was always impressing upon his Redemptorists the importance of absolute obedience. "My Father! I am cold; give me a little of your warmth, and tell me at least what I shall do!" Thus runs one of the many notes, which in his anguish he wrote to his director.³ Each time he had to act, this famous moral theologian, who had to govern an order as well as a bishopric, was as bewildered as a child. It was not only such a question as that of giving up or retaining his see which could set him endlessly arguing; he was just as hopelessly at a loss in face of the problem whether he should have a sack of straw under his head or not.

Work among those who had been led astray first aroused Liguori's moral interests; it was no wonder, therefore, that ethics became to him principally casuistry, and that the problem of Probabilism occupied his thoughts at an early period. In those days complaints of the slackness of the Jesuit moral system were heard on all sides; and an honest man, like Cordara, dared not deny that the ethics of the order had a shady side, although, like a good Jesuit, he was more inclined to regard the doubtful teaching as a theoretical weakness than as an offence against right.⁴ The most

¹ Döllinger-Reusch I, 371.

² *Ibid.*, 376.

³ *Lettere* I, 78.

⁴ "Quis enim neget in re morali quædam nostris scriptoribus excidisse, quæ

objectionable point in Jesuit ethics was the teaching about moral probability. According to the Jesuit view, a clear and certain recognition of the right course of action is in most cases difficult, and in some impossible; therefore in every action and every moral opinion a man must take into consideration its greater or less probability.

Probabilism, as it was called (or Laxism)—and the Jesuits were as a rule Probabilists—went so far as to teach that in doubtful cases it was allowable to follow the less safe opinion, even if it were also the less probable, nay, even if it had an extremely small degree of probability (*tenuiter, dubie, probabiliter probabilis*). Rigorism (or Tutorism), on the other hand, insisted that when there was a doubt about the lawfulness of an action, it should be left undone, even if there were more reasons for its lawfulness than for the opposite. This severe doctrine, however, was condemned in 1690 by Alexander VIII., and therefore the Rigorists so far modified their view as to allow that the less safe opinion might be followed, if it were in the highest degree probable (*probabilissima*), but only in that case.

Liguori had been brought up to the severe view, but he had learnt also that many moralists held another.¹ In the course of his work in the confessional, and among the peasants, his Rigorism dwindled more and more, especially after he had plunged into the moral theology of the Jesuit Busenbaum. In 1748 he published in Italian a manual for confessors, and in the same year the first edition of his *Morals* appeared in the form of notes and discussions supplementary to Busenbaum's famous book. In this first edition he still kept back his own opinion about Probabilism; but in the second, which was dedicated to Benedict XIV., he says in his address to the Pope that he has sought to take a middle course between the extremes of laxity and severity.² Some years later he wrote to his publisher at Venice, telling him that he must not have the book looked over by a theologian who holds the rigorous view, for instance a Dominican;

damnata deinde sunt? At errore mentis labi humana infirmitas est, non culpa." Cordara in Döllinger: *Beiträge* III, 65.

¹ For what follows cp. Döllinger-Reusch I, 412f.

² The dedication is printed in the *Lettere* III, 12f.

because the author himself does not hold those views, but takes a middle course.¹ He says, at the same time, that the Jesuits at Naples have praised his book both publicly and privately, although on some points he is too rigorous for them. In the third edition (1757) he still holds the same views unaltered; but in a Latin edition of extracts from his *Morals*, which appeared in 1758, he teaches that not only is it permissible to reject the safer opinion if the opposite one is *more* probable, but even if it is only *equally* probable.

The struggle which at that time was going on against Jesuitism, and which was partly directed at its Probabilism,² made it desirable that Liguori should prove that he did not share the lax views of the Jesuits. In a work called *Breve dissertazione dell' uso moderato dell' opinione probabile*, which appeared in 1762 at the time when he was made a bishop, he maintained with great force the so-called Equiprobabilism, a sort of half Probabilism from which he never went back. He now asserted that it was allowable to follow the less safe opinion when it is but equally probable with the safer one. In his Equiprobabilism he comes nearest to being a disciple of the Bavarian moralist, Eusebius Amort, of Pollingen.³ Liguori thought that with his modified Probabilism he had placed a sufficient distance between himself and the Jesuit Probabilism which was so strongly attacked; and in his letters he often expresses his annoyance that people could class him with the Jesuits.⁴ But, as the *promotor fidei* expressed it when he was made a "Doctor of the Church," although St Alfonso in his system is an opponent of Probabilism, he proves himself a true Probabilist when he is concerned with the decision of individual cases.

In his writings may be found instances of the notorious mental reservation of the Jesuits, as when he says: "A wife

¹ *Lettere* III, 20f. The letter is of the date 15th February 1756.

² See above, p. 36.

³ From Amort he had learned, as he says in a letter to him (*Lettere* III, 246) "quod sequi liceat opinionones æque aut quasi æque probabiles, minus notabiliter probabilibus explosis."

⁴ Thus he writes (*Lettere* III, 487), on 15th November 1776, to Remondini: "Io non seguito la dottrina de' Gesuiti, ma sono contrario al sistema de' Gesuiti, e forse alla maggior parte delle sentenze particolari de' Gesuiti. Io non sono stato scolare de' Gesuiti." Cp. 297f., 421f., where he repudiates Probabilism.

who breaks her marriage vows may deny her breach of marriage to her husband, while meaning, 'I have not done it in such a manner that I need confess it.' She may also say that she has not broken marriage, inasmuch as the marriage still exists, and when she has confessed the sin she can say, 'I am not guilty.'"¹ Busenbaum taught that anyone in extreme want may take so much of another's property as is required to save him from his necessity. To this Liguori appends the question, whether a man of note, who is ashamed to beg or to labour, may take the goods of others. His answer is: Yes, if the man is so much ashamed of begging, that he would rather die than beg. He also examines at length in his *Moral Theology*, how much a man may steal without incurring the guilt of mortal sin, and his casuistry here takes such an excursion that he gives a regular tariff. From a beggar not even a few farthings can be taken without committing mortal sin, from a poor labourer up to a shilling, from a man in easy circumstances half-a-crown, from a very rich merchant four and sixpence, while a theft from a king is only mortal sin when it exceeds fourteen shillings.² To this are added further investigations into the degrees of sinfulness according to the length of the intervals between the times when the sums were taken.

It is hardly to be wondered at that such moral theology should be characterised even by Roman Catholics as "immoral theology," or that the Abbé Laborde in 1851 exclaimed: "If Liguori's doctrine is right, then the narrow way of the Gospel is made broad, or rather it is given up, and the broad way which leads to destruction is recommended to Christians."³ But since 1871 these morals are canonised by the Roman Church, and Liguori is now to Roman Catholic ethics what Thomas Aquinas is to Roman Catholic dogmatics. The heart of the Cardinal-Archbishop of Capua beats high with joy at the thought that these two great lights in the theological world were both not only Italians, but "from our province."⁴ John Henry Newman, on the other hand, openly declared that

¹ Döllinger-Reusch I, 445f.

² *Theologia Moralis* (ed. Ninzatti, Venetiis 1882) I, 230f.

³ Döllinger-Reusch I, 469.

⁴ Capececiatello I, 427.

Liguori's defence of equivocation and the like is, in his opinion, an Italian form of morals which does not suit Englishmen.¹ But what could the protest of an individual do? Cardinal Wiseman said that even in his time there was no confessional in England which was not under the influence of "the gentle theology of this saint";² and to Cardinal Manning Liguori was *the* moral theologian. Modern Roman Catholic systems may on individual points be more or less strict than the Bishop of Sant' Agata, but the spirit is the same, and it is the spirit of Jesuitism.

It is in like manner a breath of Jesuit piety, which meets us in Liguori's doctrine with regard to the Blessed Virgin. As early as 1731 he wrote in a letter to some nuns: "Pray always to Mother Mary; and to get her to show you favour, you must love her, praise her, and honour her! Let her sweet name be always in your hearts and on your lips! You must know that she, the fair one, loves you tenderly. Be grateful and return her love! Love of Mary is a certain pledge of Paradise (*pegno sicuro del Paradiso*)."³ *Mamma mia* is the term of endearment which he always uses for the Mother of our Lord, and in all his letters she is invoked at the beginning or end, with Jesus and Joseph. In Liguori's youth Francesco Pepe, the Jesuit,⁴ had made his appearance in Naples as an ardent advocate of the doctrine of the immaculate conception of the Virgin. Francesco Pepe wrote praises of the immaculate conception on little strips of paper (*cartelline*), and these strips were taken as a dose by sick people in hopes of being cured; they were also given to hens to make them lay more eggs. Even this superstitious cultus of the Madonna was countenanced by Liguori. When he lay at death's door, he asked for one of Pepe's strips and swallowed it.

As early as 1734 he communed with Francesco Pepe about a matter which became one of the chief points in his own doctrine of Mary; that all men are saved by the Madonna's mediation, because all grace is distributed through her. In one of his pamphlets he gives a popular account of the way things are done in heaven. Appealing for support to Bernard

¹ J. H. Newman: *Apologia pro vita sua* (London 1893), 273f.

² Döllinger-Reusch I, 471f.

³ *Lettere* I, 11.

⁴ Reusch: *Index* II, 217.

of Clairvaux, he says: "The most holy Virgin places herself before her divine Son and shows Him her bosom wherein He was shut up for nine months, and her holy breast which He so often sucked. The Son then places Himself before His divine Father and shows Him His opened side, and His holy wounds, and when the Father sees such sweet pledges of the Son's love, He can deny Him nothing, and we gain all." The pamphlet ends with the words: "Hail, Jesus, our Love, and Mary, our Hope!"¹

It is chiefly in his book above mentioned, *Le glorie di Maria Vergine* (written in 1750), that his doctrine about Mary is found. According to his own account, this was the book which had caused him most trouble, and also gained him most praise.² In our days it is still very widely circulated; in Germany and France it has gone through many editions, and in England it was strongly recommended by Wiseman and Manning. But when it is printed north of the Alps, it is frequently found that a few things, especially some of the most superstitious stories, have been carefully removed. Not everywhere in these days is it safe to offer to Roman Catholic Christians the mediæval Madonna-legends of Bernardino of Siena, and Bernardino of Busto.

In this extraordinary book Mary is represented as the queen of the universe, the sweet Mother, whose prayer Jesus always hears.³ Her mediation is morally necessary, and all God's grace flows through her, *la mediatrice di grazia*.⁴ She co-operates also in our justification; for God has entrusted to her the dispensing of all grace to usward.⁵ No one comes to Christ unless the Blessed Virgin has drawn him by her prayers.⁶ Mary is our hope, and she is almighty as Christ, though only in the sense in which a creature can be so; the Son is almighty by nature; the Mother by grace.⁷ Her name is sweet in life or death; she saves people from hell, and brings her own into

¹ *Miscellanea o raccolta d'operette la più parte ascetiche* (Monza 1832) II, 42.

² *Lettere* III, 98.

³ *Le glorie di Maria Vergine* (Milano 1880, with episcopal approbation) I, 21f.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 161, 179f. Cp. II, 376f., where this section of the book is defended against an unnamed critic.

⁵ "Maria si chiama la co-operatrice della nostra giustificazione, perchè a lei ha commesso Dio tutte le grazie da dispendersi a noi" I, 175. Cp. II, 93f.

⁶ *Ibid.*, I, 175.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 191.

Paradise.¹ Salvation is easy through her. A Franciscan once in a vision saw two ladders. At the top of one, which was red, stood Christ; at the top of the other, which was white, stood Mary. Those who tried to climb up the red ladder always fell down as soon as they had gained a few steps; but when they complied with an invitation to try the white one, all went well. The Blessed Virgin stretched out her hand to them, and so they safely entered Paradise.² The moral of this story, which is taken from a Franciscan chronicle, is clear: it is difficult to be saved through Christ; but through Mary it is easy. Mary is also ascended into heaven, just as Christ is,³ and she is our pattern in all virtues.⁴ As the daughter of God the Father, the mother of the Son, and the bride of the Holy Ghost, she is conceived without taint of sin (*Maria Immacolata*).⁵

As a foundation for his doctrine of Mary, Liguori often quotes both the Old Testament and the New; but his interpretation is the wildest allegory. He affirms, moreover, that he has spent several years in collecting what the Fathers and the most celebrated ecclesiastical authors have written about Mary's mercy and power; but Old-Catholic criticism has proved that in using the works of the Fathers of the Church he has betrayed "boundless ignorance and levity."⁶ Many quotations are at second or third hand, and he attributes to Ignatius, Athanasius, Ephraem the Syrian, Augustine, Anselm, and Bernard of Clairvaux sayings which are either not in their works at all, or are found in quite a different form.

The same doubtful use of quotations from the Fathers is found in Liguori's defence of the third point in the programme of modern Jesuitism, viz., the infallibility of the Pope.⁷ To the first edition of the *Moral Theology* in 1748 there was appended a disquisition on the infallibility of the Pope and his superiority to Councils, and as late as 1776 Liguori still occupied himself with this problem. In the end of the latter year he informs his publisher that he has finished a little book on papal infallibility, but because of the persecution preparing for his congregation, and in order not to rouse the anger of

¹ *Le glorie di M. V.* I, 247.

² *Ibid.*, 264.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 235f.

³ *Ibid.* II, 149f.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 1f.

⁶ *Deutscher Merkur*, 1885, Nos. 50, 51.

⁷ Döllinger-Reusch I, 396f.

modern *litterati*, he does not mean to publish it—at all events not under his own name. But he is so delighted with his work, that he dares to assert that the dogma of infallibility has here received a better foundation than in Zaccaria, Noghera, or any other theologian.¹ The fate of this treatise is unknown; it is uncertain whether it was ever printed. But apart from it, there are five treatises on the Pope by the hand of Liguori, which were so agreeable to many members of the late Vatican Council, that it was proposed to define the infallibility in Liguori's words.²

During the Vatican Council attention was drawn to the fact that nearly all the quotations from the works of the ancient Fathers, which are found in Liguori's treatises, are either given inaccurately, or are taken from spurious compositions;³ and Döllinger, in 1871, offered to demonstrate to his archbishop that those proofs of papal infallibility which are found in Liguori's works (as well as in those of Perrone, Cardoni, Ghilardi and Schwetz) "are for the most part spurious, forged, or garbled."⁴ However, the historical proof of infallibility is by no means the most important with Liguori. To him the infallibility of the Pope is a necessary axiom of the whole system: if God has not given the Pope infallibility, He has not taken sufficient care for the good government of His Church. And it is not only human law, the law codified by the Church, which is subjected to the Pope's interpretation and government, but also the divine law.

Belief in the Pope's infallibility was not common at the end of the eighteenth century, so it was not to be wondered at that many of Loyola's persecuted disciples should feel drawn towards Liguori and his order. St Alfonso's "powerful defence of the primacy of the Pope and of his office of infallible teacher," so highly praised by Leo XIII. in the letter to which reference has been made,⁵ first showed its effectiveness south of the Alps. But his writings and ideas have since, under the sheltering

¹ *Lettere* III, 489.

² J. Friedrich: *Geschichte des vatikanischen Konzils* (Rom. 1887) III, 1, 417.

³ J. Friedrich: *Documenta ad illustrandum Concilium Vaticanum* (Nördlingen 1871) II, 272f.

⁴ *Briefe und Erklärungen von I. v. Döllinger über die vatikanische Decrete* (München 1890), 76, 84.

⁵ See above, p. 98.

wings of the revived Jesuit order, done a great work outside Italy, and have in many places schooled people for Jesuitism. The kinship between Liguori and Loyola is felt not only in those main points upon which stress has been laid. The Bishop of Sant' Agata was as intolerant as any Jesuit. In one of his last works¹ he mentions with high praise the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, which drove all the followers of the "ungodly" Calvin out of France. He hated all forms of Jansenism and Protestantism, and thought it quite right that Sister Maria Josefa, a nun in the convent of Frasso, had been forbidden by her director to read an Italian translation of the four Gospels. "Women, and especially nuns, should not read books of that sort (*tal sorta di libri*), and least of all when they are translated into the vulgar tongue." He recommends them instead, as the best guides to a holy life (*per fare una persona santa*), stories of saints and spiritual books, especially Rodriguez and Saint Jure—two Jesuit authors.² And he calls to mind how St Theresa refused to receive a would-be nun, who brought the Holy Scriptures with her, saying that nuns should only become acquainted with the Bible through sermons and confessors, but not read it themselves. The attempts of the Jesuits to stop the work of the Bible societies would have found support in St Alfonso.

¹ *Miscellanea* II, 377f.

² *Lettere* II, 207f.

CHAPTER V

FEBRONIANISM AND JOSEPHINISM

IN 1741, after the death of Charles VI., when the German electors met to choose a new emperor, the papal nuncio, Doria, like former nuncios on similar occasions, did his best to induce the ecclesiastical electors to cancel the fourteenth article in the stipulations of election, obliging the emperor to oppose certain Roman encroachments, and to acknowledge the rights of Protestantism in accordance with the terms of the Peace of Westphalia, and with various Acts of the Diet. Instead of giving in upon this point, the electors expressed the wish that Rome would satisfy those complaints which for many centuries had found vent in the so-called *gravamina nationis Germanicæ*. A privy councillor of the Elector of Trier, named Von Spangenberg, who was a convert and the son of a Pfarrer at Harzen, was commissioned, together with an official of Trier, Johann von Hontheim, to enquire what was the real state of the case with regard to these *gravamina*, which had played a particularly prominent part at the time of the Reformation, and how far the constitution of the German Catholic Church was in accordance with existing laws.¹ As the Elector of Trier would have the first voice in the matter when it came publicly forward, it was needful for the commissaries of Trier to consider the matter very thoroughly.

The task which was thus given to Hontheim had important consequences in his after life.² Spangenberg once made the remark in a large company that it was much to be wished that

¹ Cp. a letter of Spangenberg to Von Krufft in O. Mejer: *Febronius* (Freiburg 1885), 51f.

² For what follows consult, besides O. Mejer, G. Phillips: *Justinus Febronius* in his *Vermischte Schriften* II, 160f., and Reusch: *Index* II, 940f.

some learned priest should come forward, who could place in its proper light the difference between the spiritual power of the Pope and the arrogance of the Roman Court, and who would draw the line between the ecclesiastical and the temporal power. No one was more suited to solve this problem than Hontheim; both his studies and his position made him the proper person.

Johann Nicolaus von Hontheim was born at Trier in 1701. After receiving his first instruction there from the Jesuits, he went to Louvain, where Zeger Bernhard van Espen had for nearly half a century lectured on canon law in a manner which betrayed the strong influence of Grotius' *Law of Nature*, and of Gallicanism. When Hontheim was a student at Louvain, Van Espen was an old man of nearly eighty, and no longer lectured. But canon law was taught after his manner, and the aged master often put in an appearance at the students' debates, to impress upon them those truths which were the outcome of his long years of study in Church history and jurisprudence. While at Louvain, it dawned upon young Hontheim that there was a difference between Catholicism and Popery; and at the same time his eyes were opened to the sins of Jesuitism. He became a Gallican, but not, like Van Espen himself and many of his disciples, a Jansenist as well.

His studies took him likewise to the Protestant University of Leyden; and on his return home Hontheim was made professor at the University of Trier, and afterwards commissary of the "Official" at Coblenz, superintendent of the seminary for priests in that town, and canon of the Collegiate Church of St Florian. This brought him into close communication with the Elector Franz Georg, Count of Schönborn, who usually lived at Ehrenbreitstein. Franz Georg was not contented, like his predecessors for the last hundred and forty years, to leave church matters to a suffragan, while himself attending only to politics. He had duly received consecration and zealously fulfilled his episcopal duties. At the beginning he employed Hontheim only in matters of State, such as the imperial elections in 1741 and 1745. But when his suffragan died in 1748, Hontheim became also his ecclesiastical coadjutor, as titular Bishop of Myriophyti in *partibus infidelium*. Under the next elector, Johann Philipp von Walderdorff (1756-1768),

who took more interest in the chase than in the concerns of the Church, nearly the whole conduct of ecclesiastical affairs was put into Hontheim's hands, and he had occasion to make his views felt in many directions. He endeavoured to break the power of the Jesuits at the University of Trier and in the scholastic sphere in general. He thought of substituting Benedictines for the Jesuits in the theological faculty, a plan, however, which was not carried out until after the Jesuits were expelled from France. He took care that canon law was taught on Gallican principles. His historical interest showed itself in the production of several important works throwing light on the history of Trier. They betray a zeal for collecting and sifting original documents, which was not common in those days, as well as a great love for Germany, and for his native Trier.

But the most remarkable of Hontheim's works is a goodly quarto volume: *De statu ecclesiæ et legitima potestate Romani Pontificis*, which was published in September 1763, by the bookseller Esslinger at Frankfurt. In this the author endeavours to answer the question which had been put to him at the imperial election twenty-two years before, and which he had never lost sight of since. On the title page the publisher concealed himself and the place of printing under the misleading statement: *Bullioni apud Guillelmum Eccardi*; the author called himself *Justinus Febronius*. It was a chance name, taken from Justine, his younger brother's daughter, who, on entering the convent of Juvigny near Clermont, had just then exchanged her baptismal name for that of Febronia. The book was printed with the greatest secrecy at Frankfurt. The proofs were read by Dumaix, Dean of the Collegiate Church of St Leonard, that "very clear-sighted" Roman Catholic priest, belonging to the circle of Mme. de la Roche, who gave Goethe such "full and beautiful" information about the external and internal condition of the ancient Church.¹

In the reading-room of the town library at Trier there is a portrait of Hontheim in his episcopal house-dress. If it is like him, his features bore a resemblance to those of Herder and Goethe, and something of the large-mindedness and extensive survey of those two men appears in his book.

¹ Goethe's *Dichtung und Wahrheit* (ed. Hempel) III, 130. Cp. 380f.

It is written by a learned theologian in rather ornate Latin, and an observant reader soon discovers that the author's views have been enlarged, not only by means of historical study, but by taking part in practical politics. Its author is a statesman, not a schoolman. The book contains the Gallican system transplanted to German soil. It champions the importance of the episcopate and the rights of the State as against the Papacy; and it ends with an appeal to reject utterly those claims which are based on nothing but the forged Isidorian Decretals, and to return to the constitution of the Church as it was during the first four centuries of the Christian era. In a certain sense there is not much that is new in the book; the ideas are those of Bossuet, Natalis Alexander, Fleury, and the other great Gallicans. But Febronius speaks with such clearness and authority, that the reader feels to what an extent Gallicanism has leavened his theology and his conception of Christianity. In the beginning of the book he addresses himself to the pope, the princes, the bishops, and doctors of divinity and of ecclesiastical law; and throughout these appeals it is clear that his theoretical discussions have a practical aim. He hopes to succeed in bringing the actual state of things into agreement with his ideas.

The popes are called upon to define the proper limits of their own powers. But Febronius has no belief that this summons will be heeded; therefore the princes must come forward to defend the rights of their respective national churches. In France, Gallicanism supported the rights of the French king; to Van Espen it meant maintaining the rights of his sovereign, the Emperor; to Febronius it became the assertion of the rights of each territorial prince. At the Council of Trent it had not been decided whether the bishops received their authority directly from God or from the Pope. Febronius held the former view; and he believed that the Roman Church would regain its old power of attracting, if this view were universally enforced by help of the princes. His book bore on the title page the words: *ad reuniendos dissidentes in religione Christianos compositus*, showing what he hoped would be the result, when the cause of the bishops had vanquished that of the Curia. The bishops, he says, ought never to forget that they are the successors of the Apostles, and they ought to demand the

restitution of their rights. Doctors of divinity and of canon law should get rid of the false doctrines of the Pope's jurisdiction and infallibility. The episcopal system must take the place of the papal, and the autocracy of the papal decrees must be shattered. At the beginning, the Church was by no means a monarchy; the Apostles were equal; St Peter was only the first among equals. The bishops have their rights directly from Christ, but the Pope has only received the primacy in commission from the Church. It is false doctrine to say that the Pope represents the Church, for the Church is represented by the General Council. Bishops have the right of self-government as heirs of the authority given to the Apostles to rule the Church. This former state of things must be brought back; the question is how? Priests and people must be instructed in the origin and justification of the Pope's claims. Councils must be called together, a General Council if possible, at all events National Councils, and the Catholic princes must meet and set bounds once for all to the power of the Papacy.

The nuncios at Cologne and Vienna at once sent Febronius' book to Rome, and in February 1764 it was placed on the Index. But Clement XIII. wished the affair to be kept as quiet as possible; it was not in the interests of Rome at that moment to provoke a public discussion on such a delicate point. A few weeks, however, after the book was condemned, he called upon the German electors and bishops in several letters to suppress it, and his request was acceded to even at Trier. In spite of this, the substance of the book appeared in a German form in 1764; a new and enlarged edition in 1765; in 1766 the book was translated into Italian, Spanish, and Portuguese; and in the following years new editions kept appearing. Although the Elector of Trier's prohibition of the book was couched in somewhat gentler language than the Pope's, Hontheim thought it right to ask to be released from his various offices, alleging his age and indifferent health. But the Elector refused to grant his request, and he continued to execute his offices. For safety's sake he published in one or two local papers a declaration that he was not Justinus Febronius. Although no one believed this declaration, Prince Clemens Wenzel, Bishop of Freisingen, Regensburg, and Augsburg, who succeeded the Elector Johann Philipp in 1768, made him Privy Counsellor and

"Conferenzzrath," chief of the clerical Consistory, and Minister, so that the most important part of the ecclesiastical management was put into his hands, and especially the dealings with Rome. The Pope made Cardinal Albani represent to the Elector the impropriety of entrusting such a high ecclesiastical office to a man of Hontheim's views. Hontheim himself answered on behalf of the Elector, that he had publicly denied that he was the author of the book; that Trier was by no means governed on Febronian principles; and that, on the contrary, they showed all due loyalty and sincerity towards the Roman see.¹

But Rome was not reassured. Both north and south of the Alps a number of answers to Febronius were composed. Ballerini at Verona, Sangallo at Venice, Corsi at Florence, Zaccaria at Modena, and Mamachi at Rome were some of the most notable Italian opponents of Febronianism; and in Southern Italy the Bishop of Sant' Agata sharpened his pen to fight this new foe. Hontheim replied to some of these criticisms, which swelled the later editions of his book to such an extent that in 1777 he thought it necessary to publish an abridged edition. But in spite of all these attacks, Clemens Wenzel upheld his aged servant, until an ex-Jesuit, named Beck, to whom had been given the task of teaching theology and ecclesiastical law to the Elector, who was quite ignorant of these sciences, gained such power over his noble pupil that he "did with him what he would."² By means of a long succession of intrigues, in which the papal nuncio and others played a part, Hontheim's position as the trusted adviser of the Elector was completely undermined; and at last, in 1778, they extorted from the old man of seventy-seven a moderately worded recantation.³ At Rome people exulted loudly in this victory over Gallicanism, to which so shortly before the Jesuit order had been sacrificed. At Trier it was expected and assumed that Hontheim's recantation would remain a secret; but that was not to be the case. Already on Christmas Eve 1778, Pius VI. gathered the cardinals around him in their festal robes in St Peter's, to communicate to them the recantation of the Coadjutor Bishop of Trier, and the whole Roman Catholic world was

¹ O. Mejer, 68f.

² *Ibid.*, 101f.

³ *Ibid.*, 128f. Masson, 349f.

afterwards informed of this event which was so gratifying to Rome.

In ultramontane circles the triumph of Rome found an echo, but elsewhere this victory over a feeble old man was not thought of much consequence. A. C. Hwiid, a Dane, who afterwards became Provost of the Regents College in Copenhagen, was staying at Vienna soon after the news of Hontheim's retractation had arrived, and he says that many people there "abused Febronius and said he was in his second childhood."¹ But this explanation of his retractation is hardly justifiable; Hontheim knew well what he was doing when he showed this outward obedience to Rome. He wrote: "I have in a certain way recalled my book *Justinus Febronius*, just as a much more learned prelate, Fénelon, did, in order to avoid scenes and unpleasantnesses. But my retractation does not harm, and never will harm, the world and the Christian religion; and as little does it benefit and will it benefit the Roman Court. The world has read, tried, and accepted the assertions in my book, and my retractation will no more make thoughtful minds deny or reject those assertions than will the refutations written by so many of the Pope's theologasters, monks, and flatterers."² The same keynote sounds through a Latin commentary on his retractation, which Hontheim published in 1781, and which shows us that in all essentials his standpoint remained the same.

Febronianism had made many conquests. Even before the appearance of Hontheim's famous book, the ultramontane system and the doctrine of the Pope's infallibility had begun to be put in the background in the Roman Catholic schools and class books of Germany. The Jesuits were in reality overthrown in Germany before the order was abolished. When Clement XIV. had succeeded Clement XIII. in 1769, Emmerich Joseph of Breitenbach, Elector of Mainz (1763-1774), whose Ministers were not only Gallicans but Voltairians, proposed that commissioners from the three Rhenish electors should meet at Coblenz and consult on the question of demanding "the correction of various abuses," and especially with regard to the best way of securing "the restoration of the

¹ A. C. Hwiid: *Udtog af en Dagbog, holden i Aarene 1777-1780* (Kjöbenhavn 1787) I, 44of.

² O. Mejer, 145f.

original episcopal power.”¹ These deliberations, which lasted from September till December, led to the drawing up of the thirty Latin “Articles of Coblenz,” of which nearly all are aimed at the arrogance of Rome and the extortions of the Roman chancery. There is much which points to the belief that the Articles were composed by Hontheim’s pen; at all events they contain Febronian ideas. The Articles of Coblenz were sent to the Emperor Joseph II. with a petition that the freedom of the German Church might be so established, “that the chief churches of this nation should enjoy not less freedom than the churches of other nations.” After some delay the Emperor Joseph II. replied that some of the electors’ grievances could be redressed at once by any archbishop or bishop, with the knowledge of the Emperor; others must be brought before the Diet; and others again must stand over for the present. At first the electors wished to press their case, but when they were privately informed from Vienna, that the right moment was not thought to have arrived for taking this matter up, they let it drop. So the Articles of Coblenz were only of importance as the precursors of the “Points” of Ems.

After the fall of the Jesuits, Febronianism rushed to the front everywhere in Germany. The German Benedictines, Cistercians, Franciscans, and Augustinians, and especially the numerous professors in Germany, who after the disappearance of the Jesuits were not members of any order, fearlessly acknowledged the doctrine of the Council of Constance, that a General Council of the Church was superior to the Pope, and professed the Gallican principles of ecclesiastical law.² At the same time it became possible to study history with more freedom and under better conditions. It was now no longer necessary to represent Henry IV., Henry V., Frederick Barbarossa, and Lewis of Bavaria, as wicked adventurers and half heretics, because they would not bow to the demands of the mediæval Papacy. People saw that right was not always on the side of the Papacy, and now they dared to say so. The historical sense which was awaking deprived the ultramontane system of one support after another.³

¹ O. Mejer, 76f.

² Döllinger: *Kleinere Schriften* (Stuttgart 1890), 410.

³ L. von Ranke: *Die deutschen Mächte und der Fürstenbund* (Leipzig, 1875), 88.

Even crowned heads fell more and more under the power of the Gallicanism and Febronianism which was in the air ; and Europe witnessed a faint echo of the great struggle of the Middle Ages between the Ghibellines and the Guelphs. The Romish Church had long been at war with the spirit of the age ; now it came into collision with the modern State, which assumed more and more the right of interfering in every department of life. At Vienna there was a circle of administrative officers and of professors, who not only maintained the superiority of the Councils to the Papacy, but also the power of the State in church matters and the civil duties owed by the priesthood to the State.¹ Their doctrine of the "omnipotent" State, and of the union of all rights and duties in the head of the State, made an early impression upon Joseph II. After visiting his brother-in-law, Louis XVI., in 1777, and getting a closer view of French affairs, he became an opponent of religious intolerance. He returned to Austria with the conviction that the decay to be everywhere noticed in those southern provinces of France, which are so richly endowed by Nature, was due to the persecution of the Huguenots, and that a prince should not deprive his country of the advantages to be gained from excellent Protestant agriculturists and other good Protestant subjects.² When he heard that Protestantism was to be suppressed in Moravia, he made representations to his mother in the name of religious freedom, but Maria Theresa did not understand her son's "indifference and tolerance," which, to her mind, would only lead back to the days of club law, and would bring about the ruin of Austria.³

The young Emperor, on the other hand, was convinced that religious liberty was the condition of the future greatness of Austria, and when Maria Theresa's death in 1780 gave him a free hand, he soon showed that he was a believer in tolerance, and also in the doctrine of the omnipotence of the State. As Professor Sonnenfels, one of the Liberal lecturers at the University of Vienna, said in 1782, the very first year of his

¹ C. T. Perthes : *Politische Personen und Zustände in Deutschland zur Zeit der französischen Herrschaft* (Gotha 1869) II, 70f. ; Fr. Krones : *Handbuch der Geschichte Oesterreichs* (Berlin 1879) IV, 496.

² Arneth : *Maria Theresia und Joseph II.* II, 2, 141.

³ Arneth II, 2, 157f. Cp. 146f.

reign was "more fruitful in remarkable laws, than the whole lives of other princes."¹ And the enlightened despotism of Joseph II. found a few adherents among the church dignitaries of the realm, even when it ventured upon ecclesiastical territory. Count Francis Hrzan-Haras, who, in 1780, was made a cardinal, and Austrian Minister to the Papal Court; the Archbishop of Salzburg, Primate of the Austrian Empire; the Bishops of Laibach and Königgrätz, willingly lent a hand to the carrying out of his church reforms, and defended them against the attacks which came from the rest of the episcopate led by the Cardinal-Archbishop of Vienna, Count Migazzi, and the Primate of Hungary, Count Batthyany, Archbishop of Gran.

Soon after Joseph II. became sole ruler, he granted to his dominions the freedom of the Press, by means of a law which only forbade the issue of such writings as treated in an altogether offensive manner of religion or morals, the State or the rulers of the country. After the issue of this law a number of libellous pamphlets appeared, in which both the Emperor and religion were sharply attacked. Joseph II. defended religion, but as for his own person, he let these "Büchel" writers attack it as much as they liked. Maria Theresa had ordered, in 1767, that papal Bulls should not be published in Austria without the *Placet* of the government. Joseph II. extended this order so as to apply to the decisions and decrees of all foreign religious authorities, and he commanded that the Bulls *In cæna Domini* and *Unigenitus* should be removed from the service-books.² For the future the religious orders were not to be allowed to confer directly with their generals in Rome; all transactions were to go through the Austrian envoy at the Papal Court. In order to draw away young Austrians from the foreign influences in the *Collegium Germanicum* in Rome, a college for Austrians intended for the priesthood was founded at Pavia, and to promote the formation of an Austrian Catholic national Church the Emperor supported the bishops in every way

¹ A. Wolf und H. von Zwiedineck-Südenhorst: *Oesterreich unter Maria Theresia, Joseph II., und Leopold II.* (Berlin 1884), 223.

² A. Riehl und R. von Reinöhl: *Kaiser Joseph II. als Reformator auf kirchl. Gebiet* (Wien 1881), 47f.

against the Curia. Formerly, the Austrian bishops were compelled to obtain powers from the Pope, for five years at a time, to give dispensations in certain matrimonial cases; now, the bishops in the dominions of Joseph II. were commanded to give dispensations in those cases without the Pope's permission, "because it was obviously of great importance to the State that the bishops should make use of the power which God had given them." To bind the prelates still closer to the State, Joseph determined that the bishops, before their oath to the Pope, should take an oath to the Emperor, in which they promised "all their lives to be faithful and obedient to the Emperor, and to the best of their power to promote the good of the State and the service of the Emperor; not to take part in meetings, projects, or consultations, which might be injurious to the State, but, on the contrary, when such things came to their knowledge, to inform the Emperor without delay."¹

A still greater sensation was caused by Joseph II.'s Edict of Toleration, published on 13th October 1781.² Under Maria Theresa the Protestants had existed on sufferance (*auf Kündigung*), and the Jews had been quite without rights or protection. The Protestants now received permission, wherever there were a hundred families of them, to build meeting-houses, though these were not allowed to have towers or bells nor an entrance from the street, which might give them the pretension of being churches (*so eine Kirche vorstellte*). By means of an imperial dispensation, Protestants might after this even be permitted to take public appointments and academical degrees, to enjoy full citizenship and the rights of property. A brighter day dawned also for the Jews.³ The old regulation that all children of mixed marriages must be brought up in the faith of the Roman Church was restricted. If the father were a Roman Catholic, all the children were still to be brought up in the Roman Catholic religion; but if the father were a Protestant, the sons were to follow his religion, and the daughters that of the mother. It was moreover forbidden

¹ Wolf und Zwiedineck-Südenhorst, 249f.

² Printed in Riehl and Reinöhl, 114f. Cp. G. Frank: *Das Toleranzpatent Joseph II.* (Wien 1882).

³ With regard to the ordinances affecting the Jews, see Riehl-Reinöhl, 146f.

to force non-Catholics to take part in processions or other forms of service of the "dominant religion." After these tolerant laws were made the number of Protestants increased remarkably. In 1782 there had only been 73,722 Protestants with 28 meeting-houses in German Austria; five years later there were 156,865 with 154 places of worship.¹

The year after the issue of the Toleration Edict, Joseph II. laid his hand on the numerous Austrian monasteries. In this department also some changes had been made during his mother's reign, but they were by no means of a radical nature, and were carried out with the Pope's approval. Joseph II. acted on his own account and went to work in a much more thorough fashion. In his eyes the monasteries were the abodes of idlers and strongholds of hierarchical tendencies; and when, in November 1781, some questionable conduct in the Carthusian monastery of Mauerbach in Lower Austria had attracted general attention to the monastic institutions, Joseph, in a letter to the Chancellor of his Court, set forth his plan for abolishing those monasteries which were serving no useful purpose by education, by sick-nursing, or by study.² On 12th January 1782 a rescript was issued which must be considered as the real law for dissolving monastic institutions; in consequence of which one house after another was closed.³ In 1770 there had been 2,163 monastic establishments for monks and nuns in Austria and Hungary; in 1786 no fewer than 783 of these had been dissolved in virtue of the rescript of 1782 and subsequent imperial decrees. This reduction of the convents by Joseph, which was imitated in the beginning of the following century in Baden, Bavaria, and Würtemberg, saved Austria from a revolution like the French Revolution, and one which might easily have been far more destructive; it was also a measure of great importance in political economy.⁴ Before Joseph II.'s reforms three-eighths of all landed property was in the hands of the Church, and the wealth of the convents was enormous. Although in many places a good deal of

¹ Wolf und Zwiedineck-Südenhorst, 252.

² A. Wolf: *Die Aufhebung der Klöster in Innerösterreich* (Wien 1871), 19f.

³ It is printed in Riehl-Reinöhl, 105f., and in Wolf, 27f.

⁴ Wolf, 166.

this wealth was put away before the government commissioners crossed the convent threshold, what remained caused general astonishment. It was not expected that such riches would be found. The large quantity of dead capital which was now suddenly brought into circulation had a great economic effect; the same was the case with the many men and women who by means of the convent law were restored to the family and to the commonwealth.

All Joseph II.'s church reforms sprang from his conviction that the State had the right to abolish pernicious ecclesiastical institutions, to stop abuses, and to arrange on its own account all matters of service which were not immediately connected with the faith. In defence of these reforms the Bishop of Laibach issued a pastoral letter (1783) in which he maintained that all bishops had equal power, and that the first among them, although he was the successor of St Peter, had no rights of jurisdiction over the others; to him was only given the task of preventing schisms and maintaining unity, and also of watching over the purity of the Catholic Faith. The monastic orders were human institutions which had degenerated in the course of time; the Church could well do without them, and the closing of convents would in no wise injure religion.¹

Of course the ecclesiastical reforms in Austria were variously judged of both at home and abroad. Frederick II. mockingly called Joseph II. "my brother the sacristan"; the followers of the *esprit philosophique* considered the doings in Austria to be only pernicious half measures; but many faithful Catholics looked upon Joseph II.'s reforms as the beginning of the end. At Rome the news from Vienna caused the greatest horror, and Pius VI. thought that he ought to try his powers as *il persuasore* to make the Emperor change his course. Immediately after the death of Maria Theresa there was a coolness between Pius VI. and Joseph II., because the Pope had omitted to hold the solemn service, which was customary on the death of Catholic sovereigns, maintaining that it ought only to be held for a man. When the Austrian envoy communicated this to his master, adding that Pius VI. would not allow those prelates who were dependants of the Imperial Court to wear mourning, Joseph answered: "It is a matter of complete indifference to me

¹ Fr. Krones IV, 497.

whether the Bishop of Rome is polite or rude.”¹ But in reality it was not indifferent to him. And Pius VI. resolved by visiting Austria to get an opportunity of atoning for his rudeness.

When Pius VI. informed the cardinals that he was going to Vienna, the news caused great consternation, and several of them tried to keep him back. Cardinal Bernis even wrote a letter in which he told Pius VI. that people already began to laugh at his apostolic ardour, “and ridicule is the most formidable weapon against the Church and her servants.”² But it was of no use, Pius was bent upon going. At Vienna the Pope’s intimation of his intended journey gave great surprise. Prince Kaunitz would have preferred that the Emperor should decline the visit. This the Emperor would not do, but in the letter which he sent to thank the Pope he expressed a positive assurance that it would be utterly impossible to make him change his mind with regard to the ordinances which he had introduced, partly for the better ordering of church matters, and partly to make use of the sovereign power which was his by right.³ This reply to Pius VI. was at once published in the newspapers, and Joseph II. had thereby committed himself to such an extent, that there could be no question of yielding on any essential point.

On 27th February 1782 Pius VI. left Rome and reached Vienna on 22nd March. Throughout the journey the Roman Catholic people greeted him with great joy; the Emperor Joseph II. came to meet him in a friendly manner, and himself conducted him into Vienna. Magnificently furnished apartments in a wing of the Hofburg were assigned to him; but only a single entrance led to them, and that was strictly guarded. The Austrian bishops received imperial orders to keep away from the capital, but the country people streamed in from all sides to receive the Pope’s blessing. It was necessary to use ships and barges on the Danube to house those who could not find shelter on land, and at one time it was even feared that provisions would run short. Every day the Pope had to bless as many as seven different sets of people from the open gallery of the palace, and

¹ Masson: *Le Cardinal de Bernis*, 396, following a despatch from Bernis to Vergennes.

² Printed in Masson, 396.

³ H. Schlitter: *Die Reise des Papstes Pius VI. nach Wien und sein Aufenthalt daselbst*, in the *Fontes Rev. Austr.* XLVII. (Wien 1892) 107f. This paper contains all the documents relating to the journey.

the Austrian magnates were daily admitted to kiss the Fisherman's Ring on his finger. On Easter Day Pius VI. said Mass in St Stephen's, and on the same day he appeared with the tiara upon his head on the balcony of the Jesuit church to bless a crowd of about fifty thousand people. Even the enemies of the Church were moved at the sight of the people's devotion to the Pope; but Joseph II. did not recall his ecclesiastical laws, and Prince Kaunitz, who was jealous of the Pope's popularity, showed the greatest disrespect during a visit which Pius VI. paid him, and a grievous disregard of the courtesies usually offered to a Pope. The Prince did not go down the stairs to receive his eminent guest, and Pius VI. was "quite astonished" when the Catholic Minister pressed his hand instead of kissing it. Their conversation turned upon art, not upon politics, and it was clear to Pius VI. that *il persuasore* had made no impression at all upon the old diplomatist. Nor had anything been gained by the negotiations with Joseph II. The Pope had to submit to the Edict of Toleration and the conventual law remaining in force, and it was impossible to come to an agreement about the royal *Placet*, the episcopal oath, and the power of the bishops in matrimonial cases. Pius really attained nothing by this journey, but the setting of a fateful example to his successor. In order to do Pius VI. a favour, Joseph II. gave the title of Prince of the Empire to his nephew Count Onesti; but the Pope begged the Emperor to keep back the diploma for a time "because he feared satire."¹

After the unfortunate visit to Kaunitz, Pius VI. determined to go home, and a few days later (22nd April) he left Vienna. Joseph II. was quite glad at his going. He was tired of seeing all the passages and stairs thronged with people who wanted his guest to bless rosaries and pictures, and he was shocked at the "ridiculous enthusiasm" of the women. He accompanied Pius VI. to Mariabrunn, and, before parting, they prayed together in the convent church. But the next day, imperial emissaries came to Mariabrunn to dissolve the convent. That was Kaunitz's revenge for his master's weakness.

¹ Schlitter, 197; Arneth: *Joseph II. und Leopold von Toscana; ihr Briefwechsel* (Wien 1872) I, 103.

After the Pope's visit Joseph II. continued in the path of reforms, but "quite gently."¹ A high ecclesiastical commission was appointed with Freiherr von Kressel as president. In the provinces local ecclesiastical commissions were formed, which, without reference to the Pope, took upon themselves to interfere in church affairs, and new conventual laws did away with more and more of the abodes of monks and nuns. Violent briefs came from Rome; and when Joseph II. by his own authority appointed an Archbishop of Milan, a brief was sent which nearly caused a rupture. At Christmas, in 1783, Joseph II. suddenly appeared in Rome;² it seems to have been his intention to break with the Pope altogether. He is said to have confided to Cardinal Bernis and the Spanish envoy, D'Azara, that without making any doctrinal alterations, he intended to render the Austrian Catholic Church independent of Rome, and that thirty-six of his bishops would make common cause with him. But D'Azara represented to him, that so great a change would take time; and he made Joseph II. afraid that Prussia would take advantage of the dissatisfaction which a breach with Rome would create. Joseph therefore gave up his project; and from 1784 onwards he showed greater moderation and more consideration for the old order of things in the Church. Later on, in January 1790, when Belgium was lost, both he and Kaunitz begged Pius VI. to use his influence to make the Belgian bishops and priests cease their opposition to Austria. Joseph II. was then dying, and from his deathbed he summoned with feverish anxiety his brother Leopold, Grand Duke of Tuscany, that he might take a share of the burden of government.³ But before Leopold reached Vienna, Joseph II. was dead.

Leopold II., who succeeded his brother on the imperial throne, approved of the church policy of Joseph. He considered that his imperial brother deserved well of religion for enlightening Europe and removing that superstition and those abuses, "which many deplored without having the courage to attack them directly or at the root."⁴ Before he became

¹ "Je vais tout doucement mon train," he wrote to his brother Leopold on 13th October 1783. Arneth I, 175.

² Arneth I, 196f.

³ *Ibid.*, II, 318.

⁴ Letter to Joseph, 29th November 1783. Arneth I, 189.

Emperor he had endeavoured to the best of his power to pave the way for Jansenism and Gallicanism in his Grand Duchy.

Italian Jansenism had gained a stronghold in the theological faculty which the Austrian government had instituted at the University of Pavia, and the Jansenist theologians and teachers of ecclesiastical law acquired still greater influence, when Joseph II. used the Milanese property of the Roman *Collegium Germanicum* to found a *Collegium Germanicum et Hungaricum* at Pavia.¹ Giuseppe Zola and Pietro Tamburini, the most important teachers in the new faculty, gave general offence because of their Jansenism, which did not so much take the form of a revival of St Augustine's doctrine of Grace, as that of bitter opposition to Jesuit morals and a strong tendency to church reform in the Gallican spirit. They were reproached with making a Council superior to the Pope, of denying the Pope's infallibility in matters of faith, and of maintaining that a bishop had a right to make alterations in the breviary; in short, of being the disciples not only of Cornelius Jansen, but of Van Espen and Febronius as well.²

While Pavia thus became a nest of Jansenists and Gallicans, "Bigotism" had found a safe retreat in Tuscany, which Cosimo III.'s devotion to Rome had made an Eldorado for priests and monks. In 1766 the town of Florence, with 78,635 inhabitants, had no fewer than 1,377 priests, 917 monks, and 2,134 nuns, distributed between nearly sixty convents.³ The "angelic" life had also a dark side in Florence; hideous vices prevailed behind the convent walls, and ignorance and superstition displayed itself in the priesthood. It was therefore a very difficult and rather hopeless task that the Grand Duke Leopold set himself, when he made up his mind to introduce reforms like those of Joseph in the Tuscan Church.

His greatest support in this work of reform was Scipione de' Ricci, Bishop of Pistoja and Prato, who was an enlightened, virtuous, and zealous prelate, but at the same time violent, impatient, and reckless.⁴ On his father's side Ricci belonged

¹ See above p. 118.

² Reusch: *Index* II, 956f.

³ A. von Reumont: *Geschichte Toscanas* (Gotha 1877) II, 151.

⁴ *Memorie di Scipione de' Ricci, scritte da lui medesimo e pubblicate con documenti da Agenore Gelli* (Firenze 1865) I.—II. De Potter: *Vie et Mémoires de Scipion Ricci* (Paris 1826) I.—IV.

to one of the oldest and most distinguished families of Tuscany, and his mother was a Ricasoli. He was born in 1741, and when he was fifteen years of age he came to Rome to receive the benefit of instruction from the Jesuits; their last General, Lorenzo Ricci, was a relative of his. As his Jesuit teachers told him that St Francis Borgia had promised all Jesuits that they might be certain of eternal salvation, he wished to enter the order; but both his mother and Lorenzo opposed this wish.¹ He was called home to Florence, and went afterwards to Pisa, where he studied law and theology. His theological teachers there were Benedictines from Monte Cassino, disciples of St Augustine, but "consideration for certain papal decisions² did not permit these learned monks to say all that they thought." In 1766 Scipione was ordained priest, and soon after he became *uditore* at the nunciature at Florence, and afterwards vicar-general to the Archbishop.

As such, Ricci experienced the fresh breeze that went through the Church of Rome after the abolition of the Jesuit order. He plunged into the study of the Epistles of St Paul and of the Gallican Canon Law; and the vicar-general of the Archbishop of Florence soon became known as an ardent Jansenist and Febronian. The Grand Duke, who wished to make use of him in carrying out his intended Church reforms, proposed him for the archiepiscopal throne of Pisa, but as Rome made objections, he appointed him in 1780 Bishop of Pistoja and Prato.

After the downfall of the Jesuits, the Dominicans had come into power in that diocese, as everywhere else in Tuscany. But a bishop like Ricci could not in the long run agree with the disciples of St Thomas. Already, when he went to Rome to be consecrated, people were offended because he did not approve of the adoration of the Sacred Heart of Jesus—*la cardiolatria* he calls it—which had found many zealous partisans among the Italian Dominicans;³ and in his own diocese, when he tried with a firm hand to reform some convents of Dominican nuns, the inhabitants of which were given to a curious mixture of quietism and sensuality, a storm of ill-will arose against him. Although Rome approved of his moral zeal, he was informed

¹ *Memorie* I, 11.

² See above, p. 5f.

³ *Memorie* I, 58f. De Potter I, 65f.

that he had erred in making the scandals public. Moreover, when with Jansenistic rigour he opposed the dispensations from fasting which had become common, but which in his eyes were unnecessary, he was told that he did not "believe in the Pope." "As if this new article of faith," he writes with disgust in his *Memoirs*, "were the watchword of Catholicism."¹

The sentiments of the ex-Jesuits towards Ricci were naturally not sweetened when he proposed to introduce catechising in Lent from a new Jansenistic catechism instead of the usual Lenten sermons with their pompous rhetoric; or when he took upon himself to remove several "apocryphal and unedifying" lessons from the breviary.² Offence was taken because, when visiting convents, he insisted on seeing their collections of books, and gave vent to his anger when he saw them lodged in a wretched place and full of cobwebs.³ Many looked upon such zeal for "enlightenment" as suspicious. There were Italians who considered religious enlightenment harmful to the common people; the only thing that was wanted was "a priest or a bishop who could bless the people from a high tower."⁴ The scandal grew when Ricci openly approved of Leopold's Josephine reform, and of the reduction of the number of convents, and even ventured to thank the Grand Duke, because "by means of his high and absolute authority" he had abolished the tribunal of the Inquisition in Tuscany, and so "delivered the State from the pernicious effects of a foreign Court of Justice which had been sustained by arrogance, and had thriven upon ignorance and selfishness."⁵ The more trouble the Grand Duke took to raise the episcopate and to make it independent of the Pope, the greater grew the indignation both in Tuscany and at Rome. There were Tuscan priests, who in their sermons violently attacked Joseph II. and Leopold, and on the church door at Prato were found requests for prayer on behalf of the heterodox bishop.⁶ Soon violent attacks upon Ricci appeared in the Press.

But neither he nor his prince was scared by the opposition they encountered. In the beginning of 1786 Leopold sent to the Tuscan bishops a draft scheme of church reforms which was

¹ *Memorie* I, 154. De Potter II, 24f.

³ *Ibid.*, 197.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 166f. Reumont II, 159, 176.

² *Memorie* I, 475.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 405.

⁶ *Memorie* I, 159, 234.

to be considered at diocesan synods ; and with a view to such consideration, Ricci gathered together nearly two hundred and fifty of his priests and theologians, in the autumn, to a diocesan synod at Pistoja. It was noticed at once that in his episcopal style and title he had omitted the usual addition, "by the grace of the Holy See." The proceedings of the synod caused the greatest consternation. It not only approved of the proposed programme of reforms, but it acknowledged the four Gallican propositions, and it asserted that the Church had no right to introduce new dogmas, and that its infallibility rested upon its fidelity to the Scriptures and to the primitive tradition.¹

Leopold, who daily received a report of the proceedings at Pistoja, was well satisfied with it all, and next year he summoned all the bishops of Tuscany to a national or general synod in the Palazzo Pitti at Florence. Ricci had told him beforehand that this was too hasty a step, because both priests and laymen were still too unenlightened, and the bishops too fast bound to Rome.² He had also cautioned Leopold against summoning the national synod to Florence, where there was an archbishop with Romish sympathies, a papal nuncio, and a great army of fanatical monks. But with the feverish impatience of an absolutism which is bent on reform, Leopold would neither wait nor call the national synod to any other town than the capital.

It turned out as Ricci had said. Only the Bishops of Chiusi and Colle supported him when he advocated the projected reforms ; all the other bishops opposed him so strongly that for a moment he even thought of resigning his see. Leopold ordered him to retain his office, but as he saw the hopelessness of continuing the proceedings, he dissolved the meeting. How indignant Leopold was with the ruling tendency in the Church can be seen from his letters to his brother. In his eyes Pius VI. is an ignorant person, in French leading strings ; a man generally despised, capable of selling everything for money, and filled with hatred of "our House."³ Three years after the national synod in the Palazzo Pitti, when he was called to the Imperial throne, he was obliged to leave the government of Tuscany to a regency, but his advice to the regency was, that

¹ *Memorie* I, 491f.

² *Ibid.*, 503f.

³ Arneith II, 76.

in church matters and important questions they should never show any obsequiousness towards the Court of Rome.¹

When Leopold left Tuscany, Ricci lost his main support. The new government had neither the power nor the will to protect him, and after receiving the imperial crown Leopold's zeal for reforming the Church cooled considerably. The troubles in Hungary, the Turkish war, the loss of Belgium, and the French Revolution gave him other things to think of, and warned him to be careful. The exigences of the Emperor's position did not escape the vigilance of opponents, and religious fanaticism was let loose upon the unbefriended bishop. Even while the national synod was still assembled, people had spread a report at Prato that Ricci, who did not like exaggerated veneration of the relics of saints, intended to pull down the altar in the cathedral of Prato which enclosed a precious relic in the form of the girdle of the Blessed Virgin. This report caused quite a revolution in Prato, and at last the waves rose so high in Pistoja likewise that Ricci had to flee from his palace. After his flight "the will of the people" destroyed all the fruits of the synod of Pistoja; and at Pisa, Leghorn, and Florence the "Scipionists" were subjected to persecution. In the country, where Ricci had sought sanctuary, everyone left the parish church when he went up to the altar, so that he was obliged to say his Mass in a private chapel.

The Emperor Leopold came to Florence, but Ricci got no comfort from a conversation with him; the Emperor was silent and oppressed, and engrossed by the threatening clouds which were gathering on the political horizon. His successor, the young Archduke Ferdinand, had no appreciation of the fight which his father and the Bishop of Pistoja had fought together. Under such circumstances there was nothing for Ricci to do but to resign his bishopric and seek shelter on an estate in the country. He took this step in 1791,² but from his retreat he followed the course of events in France with the greatest interest. Grégoire and the Gallicans had all his sympathy. Even before he laid down his crosier, he had expressed in two letters to friends in France his approval of the Civil Constitution of the Clergy, and of the oath taken to it by the Jansenist and

¹ C. Cantù : *Histoire des Italiens traduite*, par Lacombe (Paris 1861) XI, 33.

² *Memorie* II, 361f.

Gallican bishops.¹ His opinions were not kept to himself, and in Tuscany he was now looked upon as a Jacobin. His enemies and those of Febronianism were active at Rome, and in 1794 Pius VI. issued the Bull *Auctorem fidei*, which condemned the "errors" of Ricci and of the synod of Pistoja. The same year both Zola and Tamburini were dismissed from their professorships at Pavia.²

During those troubled times, when one day the French were in power, and the next day superstitious mobs which rushed along with the picture of the Madonna for their banner and with the Madonna herself as their heavenly *Generalissima*, Ricci bore his part of his country's suffering. The French did him no personal violence, but the mob with its Roman sympathies put him for a time in prison. The hatred of this enemy of superstition was still alive, and Ricci seemed to be firm in his Febronianism. In 1796 he wrote to Bishop Grégoire: "The triumph of the faith will not come about so long as the successor of the poor fisherman, St Peter, is also the successor of the great Cæsars."³ But Rome worked with untiring energy in hopes of wresting a retractation from the Italian Febronian, as had been done from Febronius himself. This goal was reached when Pius VII. passed through Florence in 1805 on his return journey from the Imperial coronation at Paris. Ricci signed a mild form of recantation and was afterwards kindly received in the Palazzo Pitti by the Pope and many of his old opponents. It was not for the sake of his personal advantage that he took this step; personally he gained nothing by it. But for a long time he had been pained by the thought that he stood as a sign of strife within the Church of Tuscany, and that he was a cause of offence to many simple souls. He did not give up his Jansenism and Febronianism in spite of his outward retractation; but he saw that the time had not yet come for his opinions to gain the victory. Yet a smile must have flitted across the old bishop's face at the festival of reconciliation in the Palazzo Pitti, when Pius VII.'s confessor said that the synod at Pistoja was the real cause of all the revolutions which then kept Europe in disturbance.⁴

¹ *Memorie* II, 375f.

² Reusch: *Index* II, 957.

³ Reumont II, 252.

⁴ *Memorie* II, 400f. De Potter III, 103f. Ricci died in 1810.

At the same time that the Grand Duke of Tuscany, with the help of the Bishop of Pistoja, endeavoured to carry out his church reforms, Febronianism was solemnly acknowledged by the great princes of the Church, north of the Alps, who felt that their power was threatened by the arrogance of Rome.

After the Reformation, the popes had sent nuncios to Germany and Switzerland in order the better to carry on the war against Protestantism by their aid. Vienna, Cologne, and Lucerne had gradually become fixed places of residence for such emissaries, and the papal nuncio in Vienna had often been useful as "an embodiment of the idea of the Counter-Reformation." These nuncios were always representatives of the Pope, but their authority was not the same everywhere.¹ The bishops had often felt that their dignity was impaired by the establishment of the nunciatures, and now and then they had protested against Rome's manner of proceeding. Thus, when a new nunciature was to be formed at Munich, the bishops concerned became uneasy. Although there was no particularly eminent prelate in Bavaria to feel aggrieved, this part of Germany was under the Archbishop of Salzburg and the Elector of Mainz. These two princely dignitaries, who held Febronian views, saw that the object of the new nunciature was to destroy their influence in Bavaria, where the Elector was in the leading strings of the ex-Jesuits. They made representations accordingly to Rome; and on not receiving a satisfactory answer to a question about the limits of the new nuncio's powers, they, in conjunction with the Electors of Trier and Cologne, sent representatives to a congress held in August 1786, in the Vier Thürme hotel at Ems.²

Here the envoys of the four prince-bishops agreed to the so-called "Points of Ems," which were soon after acknowledged by the prelates concerned, and handed to the Emperor, together with a letter in which the three Electors and the Archbishop of Salzburg declared themselves willing, in the name of freedom

¹ O. Mejer : *Die Propaganda, ihre Provinzen und ihr Recht* (Göttingen 1853) II, 180f. ; 108f.

² E. Münch : *Geschichte des Emsercongresses und seiner Punctate* (Carlsruhe 1840). M. Stigloher : *Die Errichtung der päpstlichen Nuntiaturen und der Emsercongress* (Regensburg 1867). O. Mejer : *Zur Geschichte der röm.-deutschen Frage* (Rostock 1871) I, 89f.

and nationality, to enter upon a contest against the encroachments of Rome. The "Points" themselves are in the main a repetition of the thirty Articles of Coblenz.¹ The eminent princes of the Church declare, that in the Pope they see the Primate of the Church, but that on no account will they acknowledge the power which the successors of St Peter have assumed in virtue of the false Decretals of Isidore. They appeal to the Emperor to call a synod, or in some other way to give the bishops an opportunity of getting rid of those abuses which by degrees have crept in, and to re-establish ecclesiastical discipline. If the Pope has not acknowledged the "Points" of Ems within the course of two years, they desire that a German National Council should meet to ensure their execution.

Hontheim, who, because of his great age, was not present at Ems, expressed to his Elector his joy at "this great and happy step towards the freedom of the German Church"; but he made no concealment of the slightheadedness of his faith in Councils. He thought that it had often been shown, and the last time at Trent, that it was very difficult to protect such meetings against intrigues proceeding from without or from within, and that the members of the Councils were generally tempted to think more of their own advantage than of the good of the Church and true discipline.² This letter seems to have been the last work which issued from the pen of the aged bishop. Four years after the congress at Ems, he died, full of days, with a bright hope that his ideas were well on the way to gaining the victory in the land he loved so well.

This hope was not fulfilled. Carrying out the "Points" of Ems would of necessity lead to the total abolition of the Pope's primacy in its mediæval form; and in the face of such projects the Pope was, of course, compelled to bring all his powers into action. The Emperor Joseph II. received the appeal of the prince-bishops very graciously, and called upon them in conjunction with their suffragans "to shake off the Roman yoke"; but he was not unaware that Rome was using all possible arts of intrigue.³ To the new nuncio at Cologne,

¹ See above, p. 116.

² O. Mejer: *Febronius*, 206f.

³ "Je ne sais ce qui en arrivera, mais Rome intrigue beaucoup contre," wrote Joseph to his brother. Arneth: *Joseph II. und Leopold von Toscana* II, 43. That Leopold also followed the affair with interest is shown by his reply, p. 48f.

Bartolommeo Pacca, then a man of thirty years of age, was committed the task of leading the host against the rebels of Ems; and he acquitted himself of this difficult charge with great ability.

The Elector of Cologne, Max Franz, Maria Theresa's youngest son, who had received the electorship in 1784, agreed with his two elder brothers on church matters; and he was not too particular about fulfilling his ecclesiastical duties. Now and then he contented himself with attending Mass on horseback outside the church window, or in an open carriage before the church door. But he had assumed a sort of ecclesiastical manner. Mozart, who knew him at Salzburg, wrote of him in 1781, when he was still only Coadjutor at Cologne: "When God gives anyone an office, He gives him also understanding. This has been the case with the Archduke. Before he was a priest, he was much cleverer and wittier, and he talked less, but with more sense. Now you should see him! Stupidity glares out of his eyes; he chatters and talks away for ever, and all in a falsetto voice; his neck is swollen up. In a word, it is as if he were turned quite upside down."¹ Max Franz refused to receive Pacca before the new nuncio had renounced all pretensions to jurisdiction, and soon after Pacca's arrival the new University of Bonn was opened (November 1786). On this occasion things were so "philosophically" done that one of the Canons of Cologne said that the whole thing was "a solemn declaration of war against the Holy See."²

But in spite of his youth Pacca was quite equal to the occasion. Immediately after his arrival at Cologne, he wrote to the priests in the electoral dioceses of Mainz, Trier, and Cologne. He said that it had come to the ears of the Pope that certain archbishops had overstepped the limits of their powers by granting dispensations, which were the prerogative of Rome—especially for marriages between relatives. Children born of such unions were to be counted as born in incest. And as Pacca had begun, so he continued. He was filled with a burning enthusiasm for the cause of Rome, while the four ecclesiastical princes, who

¹ C. T. Perthes: *Politische Zustände und Personen in Deutschland* I, 194.

² Pacca: *Historische Denkwürdigkeiten über seinen Aufenthalt in Deutschland*, 1786-1794 (Augsburg 1832), 54.

had set up the "Points" of Ems, were ill-fitted to be church reformers. The Elector of Mainz, Friedrich Carl Joseph von Erthal, was a thoroughly worldly-minded man, who lived for society and hunting, for pomp and grandeur. According to Pacca he only remembered that he was a bishop, when there was a chance of causing the Pope uneasiness or of opposing the Holy See.¹ Several of his circle were Rationalists or Voltairians.

It could not be concealed from anyone that religious indignation at the encroachments of the Papacy had not nearly so much to do with the action of these high German prelates as worldly lust of power. They gained no support from their suffragans, nor yet from the congregations. The Bishop of Speyer rose at once and set himself vigorously against the policy of the electors. The other German bishops afterwards made common cause with him—doubtless, not for church reasons alone. Just as in the Middle Ages, the bishops preferred having the far-away Pope as their immediate superior instead of a metropolitan close at hand. Religiously-minded laymen, likewise, turned away from these pompous and worldly prelates, who often were anything but blameless in their lives. Not in this form could Febronianism hold its own against Rome's persecution. By order of the Curia an exhaustive official "reply" (*Responsio*) to the German prelates was published in November 1789, partly composed by Pacca and Zaccaria. In this, Pius VI. claimed supreme authority in the Church, and he even dared to apply the text about obeying God, rather than men, to those cases in which the Pope's will was contrary to the law and statute of the land.²

But the publication of this pamphlet was contemporary with the outbreak of the French Revolution, and events in Paris soon threw a veil of oblivion over the "Points" of Ems. Already in 1792, when Archbishop Maury, as Papal Nuncio Extraordinary, visited the prelates of the Rhine, a couple of them had lost all sympathy for the "Points" of Ems. The Elector of Mainz called the Archbishop of Salzburg "a madman," and the

¹ Pacca 14. Cp. Perthes I, 22f., and F. Leitschuh: *Franz Ludwig von Erthal, Fürstbischof von Bamberg und Würzburg* (Bamberg 1894), 9f.

² Reusch: *Index* II, 953.

Congress of Ems "a collection of stupidities";¹ and Max Franz of Cologne himself spoke "with the greatest contempt" of the Congress of Ems and of his colleague at Salzburg.²

Just as Gallicanism, in the course of time, was in many cases influenced by the philosophical school, so Febronianism was influenced both by *l'esprit philosophique*, and by German rationalism. In 1776 a secret order was formed in Germany, the so-called "Illuminati."³ Their organisation was framed after the pattern of both the Jesuit order and the Freemasons; and their object was to fight for the light against the darkness of superstition, and especially against all Jesuitism. The founder of this order was Adam Weishaupt, a moral philosopher and Professor of Ecclesiastical Law at Ingolstadt, that ancient stronghold of Jesuitism. Weishaupt himself was educated by the Jesuits, but he was seized with the ideas which issued from France, and became an enthusiast for "enlightenment." The sign of the order of the Illuminati was P.M.C.V. (*Per me cæci vident*, through me the blind see), and their watchword was "to make Reason rule." The members of the different grades of the order were instructed in the dogmas of enlightenment, just as were the pupils of the Jesuits in the Church of Rome. Among the Illuminati the same obedience was exacted, and the same system of espionage held sway, as among the Jesuits. The lower grades were to read books which might serve to educate the heart; didactic poems and fables formed their poetical reading, but besides these the writings of Seneca, Epictetus, Marcus Aurelius, Plutarch, Adam Smith, Basedow, Helvetius, and others were recommended. The higher grades were to lay special stress on a civil and religious training; besides Weishaupt's own works, which betray the powerful influence of Rousseau, they were to study "books of religion," such as the *Système de la Nature* and the works of Helvetius. The Illuminati extended far beyond the boundaries of Germany and the Church of Rome; they had a few followers in Denmark, and many in Sweden. But their great increase awoke in their

¹ *Correspondance diplomatique et mémoires inédits du Cardinal Maury*, par Ricard (Lille 1891) I, 31.

² Maury I, 40.

³ G. Frank: *Geschichte der protest. Theologie* (Leipzig 1875) III, 28f. H. Hettner: *Literaturgeschichte des 18ten Jahrhunderts* III, 333f.

opponents the lust of persecution. Weishaupt was deprived of his office as "a conceited usher"; and a price was even put upon his head, after he had taken refuge with the Duke of Gotha, where he died in 1830. A few years after his flight from Ingolstadt the order began to dwindle away, but not without having partly fulfilled its object—the gathering together for common action of the enemies of Jesuitism in Germany. This object has been bequeathed to the Freemasons, who both north and south of the Alps and the Pyrenees still wage vehement war against the followers of Loyola and their work in State, Church, and school.

CHAPTER VI

THE FRENCH REVOLUTION

THE Jansenist bookseller of Paris, Hardy, relates in his *Memoirs* that in 1744, when Louis XV. was dangerously ill, six thousand Masses for his recovery were ordered in the sacristy of Notre Dame; in 1757, after Damiens' attempt upon his life, the number of Masses paid for on that account was six hundred; in 1774, when the King was at the point of death, the number ordered was only three.¹ These figures are a thermometer which shows the rise and spread of infidelity in the capital, and the declining sense of affection for the Royal Family.

In Paris and many other places in France people talked of the glorious "Age of Reason" and the "Enlightened century," which had begun since the sun of philosophy had put to flight the former state of intellectual nonage. Philosophy was hailed as the heir of religion. The ideas of Voltaire, Rousseau, and the Encyclopædists were advocated with an enthusiasm which savoured of the religious fanaticism of former ages. The doctrine of the philosophers about *la bonté originale* spread far beyond the philosophic circle, supplanting the doctrine of original sin and the congenital corruption of man, which had formed the background to the seriousness of the Jansenists.² The Jansenistic paper, *Nouvelles ecclésiastiques*, complained that the young received no support against aggressive infidelity in the philosophical teaching of

¹ Aubertin: *L'esprit public au XVIII^{me} siècle* (Paris 1873), 415.

² Now we come upon confessions like this: "L'erreur peut-être la plus grave que la philosophie du dernier siècle ait commise . . . c'est d'avoir substitué le dogme de la bonté naturelle de l'homme à celui de sa perversité foncière." F. Brunetière in the *Revue des deux Mondes*, 1895, 1st January, 116.

the University of Paris.¹ On the threshold of the Revolution the Abbé Coyer wrote a "moral catechism" for boys of six or seven years of age, from which the citizens of the future were to learn virtue. In this catechism faith, hope, and love as "scholastic" virtues are superseded by the new trilogy, justice, beneficence, and courage; and great men are set up as patterns in the place of Christ. Children were, as another of the pedagogues of the period expressed it, "the hope of philosophy"; and by giving them an education such as "the Spartans, the Persians, and Telemachus" had received, it was expected that in a short time such men would be moulded as religion could not match, and whom the Court could not corrupt.²

Unhappily for France, the Church was at that time ill fitted to combat the terrible foe, which was advancing from every quarter.³ Formerly the French Church had possessed great orators who with their brilliant rhetoric were able to dazzle those whom they could not convince; now she was all but dumb. Ecclesiastical eloquence in the grand, classical style had gone to the grave with Massillon; only in Père Bridaine had there been a faint echo. After the middle of the eighteenth century the French bishops only became eloquent when the object was to attack Protestantism, and to point out the dangers which threatened France, if the Protestants were allowed religious liberty. In their pastoral letters high prelates were capable of flattering the Court in a manner that was nothing less than blasphemous. The Bishop of Saint-Papoul spoke of the birth of the Duke of Normandy (Louis XVII.) in terms which were taken from the Christmas Gospel.⁴ Episcopal speakers sometimes avoided using the name of Christ in the pulpit, speaking only of "the law-giver of the Christians."⁵ Instead of fighting against that unbelief which raised its head everywhere both in literature and in the community, the French prelates

¹ Sicard : *L'éducation morale et civique avant et pendant la révolution*, 164.

² Sicard, 179f.

³ A. de Tocqueville : *L'ancien régime et la révolution* (Paris 1866), 219f. Sicard : *L'ancien clergé de France* (Paris 1893), 193f.

⁴ Sicard : *L'ancien clergé*, 212. Rocquain, 318f.

⁵ H. Taine : *Les origines de la France contemporaine. L'ancien régime* (Paris 1876), 382.

were satisfied with rousing the King's suspicions against the "unbelieving" Maria Antoinette, who had caused the removal of the Duke of Aiguillon, and with complaining because a portfolio had been entrusted to the Protestant Necker.

Formerly, the French bishoprics had been open to all; under Louis XIV. and XV., they were as good as always bestowed upon noblemen. These noble pastors seemed to have quite forgotten how the Council of Trent had reminded bishops of the duty of residence, and during their long winter sojourn at Paris and Versailles the grandeur and luxury in which they lived excited more indignation than admiration. A few of them, such as Cardinal Rohan, Archbishop of Strassburg, who gained such unhappy notoriety through the necklace affair, in spite of princely incomes, fell into bottomless debt. These noble bishops were often so ignorant in all ecclesiastical and theological questions that they could not write their own pastoral letters; and because of the Jansenistic sympathies of their theologians, they not infrequently expressed Jansenistic opinions which in reality were quite foreign to the minds of these great lords. Their self-indulgence and want of earnestness caused general indignation. Grégoire says in his *Memoirs* that the faithful only knew from hearsay what a bishop looked like, and that Confirmation was neglected to such an extent, that, according to a popular saying, the seven sacraments had been reduced to six.¹

The reports of brilliant fêtes, balls, and plays in bishops' palaces and convents gave great offence to those who cared for the Church. The Abbot of Clairvaux, the ancient monastery of St Bernard, held quite a court. He drove four horses, and insisted upon his monks addressing him as *Monseigneur*. When Cardinal Rohan resided in his palace at Saverne, he had seven hundred beds, one hundred and eighty horses, and twenty-five valets for his numerous high-born guests.² It was not talk of the kingdom of God which seasoned the luxurious feasts of these wealthy prelates. More than one of the French bishops in the days of Louis XVI. were altogether unbelievers. A simple priest, it used to be said, ought to believe something, else he will be called a hypocrite; but if he is steadfast in

¹ *Mémoires de Grégoire* (Paris 1837) II, 26.

² Taine, 154f.

the faith, he will be thought bigoted. A vicar-general can permit himself to smile at religion; a bishop can laugh at it; and a cardinal can make jokes about it.¹ The smile of the vicar-general was seen, when the Abbé Bassinet of Cahors in 1767, in the chapel of the Louvre, delivered the customary oration in memory of St Louis, in which he described the Crusades as a mixture of folly, cruelty, and injustice; did not mention God nor any of the saints, nor quoted a single word of Scripture. A marked example of the bishops' mockery was given by Loménie de Brienne, Archbishop of Toulouse, sometime Minister of State, who openly laughed at miracles and relics. When there was a question of making him Archbishop of Paris, Louis XVI. raised the objection, that in that position there ought to be a man who believed in God.² Brienne belonged to that group of French prelates, who had let dogma go in order only to lay stress on statesmanship; the bishops and abbots of this "new school" were called *les prélats administrateurs*.

When the state of the pastors and teachers of the Church was such, it was not wonderful that unbelief and immorality spread in the flock, and complaints were heard from all parts that Sundays and feast days were not kept, because indifference and doubt had taken the place of the ancient faith. France became more and more ripe for revolution, and at last the long foreseen day arrived, when, as Joseph de Maistre said, the giant who carries the world changed shoulders.

At the beginning of the Revolution the French Church possessed three great privileges. In a religious sense the whole country was one. The Roman Church was not only the Church of the State, but also the dominant Church to such a degree that free exercise was not permitted to other confessions and religions. This ruling Church had the schools entirely in her power; and her great possessions were untaxed.³ It was especially the intolerance of the prelates, and the immunity of ecclesiastical property from taxation, which aroused indignation everywhere. When Louis XVI. was anointed, Archbishop Brienne, in spite of his unbelief, admonished the King that it was reserved for him to give

¹ Taine, 382.

² Rocquain, 399.

³ E. Méric: *Le clergé et les temps nouveaux* (Paris 1892), 5f.

the death-blow to Calvinism in France; and in 1789 the Abbé de la Rochefoucauld spoke with contempt of the Protestants, as that sect which in the midst of its ruin had the effrontery to seek to appropriate to falsehood those privileges which belong only to truth.¹ Every concession to the Protestants was met with grudging resentment on the part of the priesthood. In 1788, when the Notables wished to extend taxation to lands belonging to the Church, the assembly of the clergy made vigorous protests against the proposal as an overthrow of all laws human and divine. The clergy had repeatedly shown that the Church was willing to give great free-will offerings for the good of the country;² but after 1788 the prelates declared that honour and conscience alike forbade them to give their consent to turning a charitable contribution into a forced tax.³ The most religious of the bishops, as Talleyrand says, opposed the new taxation in order not to touch "the patrimony of the poor";⁴ the prelates of high birth hated every form of change; and the rest said, that the Church in order to fulfil her great mission, and to maintain her high social position, was bound to retain the wealth with which ancestral piety had endowed her. This resistance on the part of the priesthood only caused irritation, and criticism fastened upon the large sums which went yearly to pay the prelates. It was said that France had too many bishops, and that they were too richly rewarded. The eleven archbishops, and one hundred and twenty-three bishops had an annual income of nearly 8,500,000 francs. The incomes of the vicars-general and canons exceeded 13,000,000; seven hundred and fifteen abbeys *in commendam* brought their holders 9,000,000 a year, and seven hundred and three priors received nearly 1,500,000.⁵ And while some bishops and abbots, who did nothing, had 100,000 francs a year or even much more, there were over-worked priests, who received barely 700.⁶ Such circumstances caused ill-feeling, and when the Revolution broke out, not only the immunity of church property from taxation,

¹ E. de Pressensé: *L'église et la révolution française* (Paris 1889), 25f.

² Méric, 176f.

³ De Pressensé, 23.

⁴ *Mémoires du Prince de Talleyrand* (Paris 1891) I, 24f.

⁵ De Pressensé, 9.

⁶ Taine: *La révolution* (Paris 1878) I, 212.

but the church property itself was lost, religious unity was destroyed, and the power of the Church over the schools was broken.

In the first period of the Revolution, the alterations of the existing system aimed at forming a gentle transition to a new arrangement of ecclesiastical affairs. Church property was confiscated, but the State took over the duty of maintaining Divine service, of providing for the support of the clergy, and of relieving the poor.¹ The convents and the religious orders were dissolved. It was determined that no one should be molested for his opinions—certainly not on the ground of his religious opinions—so long as he made no breach of the public order, established by law, in the course of propagating them. Freedom of worship was allowed; civil marriage was introduced; at one time there was talk of a separation of Church and State. But if this was to be carried through, the State must either take the church property without pledging itself to pay the clergy, or it must allow the Church a kind of freedom of action. The first of these alternatives would at that stage of the Revolution have been stamped as sacrilege; the other was rejected because it might give the Church a dangerous independence and make of it a State within the State. It was necessary to attach the clergy to the Revolution, and this was the purpose of the so-called “Civil Constitution,”² the composition of which was greatly influenced by the former Advocate-General of the clergy, the Jansenist Camus, who was one of the deputies of the third Estate.³

By the Civil Constitution the French bishoprics were to be altered, and their number cut down, so that each of the new departments should form a diocese. Bishops and prelates were to have a smaller, but a fixed stipend, and to be chosen

¹ “L’Assemblée Nationale déclare que tous les biens ecclésiastiques sont à la disposition de la nation, à la charge de pourvoir d’une manière convenable aux frais du culte, à l’entretien de ses ministres, et au soulagement des pauvres.” Decree of 2nd November 1789. That the Budget of Public Worship, which in our days has been so much attacked from the Radical side, is really a creation of the Revolution has been proved with great force, amongst others, by A. Leroy-Beaulieu: *La révolution et le libéralisme* (Paris 1890), 241f.

² This is printed in part in L. Sciout: *Histoire de la Constitution Civile du clergé* (Paris 1872) I, 182f.; the whole in A. Theiner: *Documents inédits relatifs aux affaires religieuses de la France 1790-1800* (Paris 1857) I, 243f.

³ L. Séché: *Les derniers Jansénistes* (Paris 1891) I, 193f.

by the laity; the bishops by the electors to the council of the departments; the priests by the electors to the governing boards of the respective districts (*l'assemblée administrative du district*). Jews and Protestants had the rights of electors no less than Roman Catholics. This radical alteration of the ecclesiastical system, in which the faithful adherents of the Roman Church not unreasonably saw something more than a harmless "civil scheme for the clergy," met with strong opposition from most of the ministers of the Church; and even a man like Talleyrand was inclined at a later time to call the Civil Constitution the greatest political mistake of the National Assembly.¹ It annulled at a stroke the Concordat of 1516, and excluded King and Pope from the selection of bishops and priests. The wrath of the French priesthood, however, soon took a lower key, when Mirabeau declared that if the priests made opposition, the nation might question whether they could ever prove useful citizens. The people, he said, would never allow the care of their souls to be entrusted to men who were enemies to the people's welfare.

At Rome the adoption of the Civil Constitution aroused the greatest alarm—the more so as the National Assembly appeared to be inclined to take possession of Avignon and Venaissin, the inhabitants of which in May 1790 had declared themselves in favour of reunion with France. Cardinal Bernis, who was still the representative of France with the Holy See, saw in the Civil Constitution a subversion of the whole discipline and system of the Roman Church,² and his strong language in a despatch to the Foreign Minister of France made Louis XVI. exceedingly reluctant to give his confirmation to the Civil Constitution.

When the news of the great event which had taken place in France reached Rome, Pius VI. delivered a passionate address to the cardinals at a secret consistory on 29th March 1790, in which he complained of the injustices inflicted upon the Church in France; and he told the princes of the Church that he only held his peace because he thought that the moment was not yet come to speak.³ On 10th July he sent a letter

¹ *Mémoires du Prince de Talleyrand* II, 123.

² Bernis to Montmorin, 30th June 1790. Masson: *Le Cardinal Bernis*, 479.

³ A. Theiner: *Documents* I, 1f. Cp. Sciout I, 265f.

to Louis XVI., in which he warned the King against leading his people into error, or provoking a schism—perhaps even a religious war—by confirming the impious Constitution, and he threatened to lift up his voice as supreme Pastor in case his warning was not taken.¹ The threat made an impression upon Louis, but the will of the National Assembly was unmistakable. Two days after the receipt of the Pope's letter—28th June—Louis was compelled to promise to confirm the decree establishing the Civil Constitution, but on the condition that it should not be published until it had gained the approval either of the French bishops or of the visible Head of the Church.²

The same day Louis sent a letter to Pius VI. in which he assured him that he prized most highly his title of the Eldest Son of the Church. If he had considered it necessary to execute the decree, it was only because he hoped thereby to be able to ward off a disastrous breach, which would bring calamity, not only upon the French Church, but upon the Church at large.³ At the same time Bernis received instructions to induce Pius VI. to agree to some particular points in the Constitution—amongst others the rearrangement of the bishoprics. The Cardinal at once perceived that this was impossible; the best that was attainable was the speedy issue of such a brief as might pacify men's minds and strengthen the King's position, by condemning the Constitution indeed, but letting one or two things in it pass as temporary concessions.⁴ Pius VI. thought that he could not draw up such a brief without laying the case before a congregation of the cardinals. The cardinals had great sympathy with Louis XVI., but would on no account consent to acknowledge the Constitution in any way, because such a step might have serious results elsewhere.⁵ Before the cardinals had finished their deliberations, Pius VI. received word that Louis, compelled by circumstances, had sanctioned the Constitution. On receiving this information, the Pope wrote him a confidential letter, containing a gentle reproof and a reference to a fuller communication

¹ Theiner I, 5f.

² Masson, 481.

³ Theiner I, 264f.

⁴ See Bernis' *Pro-memoria importante confidenziale* in Theiner I, 275f.; and also the three preceding documents.

⁵ Masson, 485f.

to be sent later when the cardinals should have finished their deliberations.¹

But in France the current of events rushed on regardless of pope and cardinals. When at length, on the 27th of October, it had been settled in Rome that Louis was to be told that the new decree must be altogether rejected, the decree was actually being put in execution. The chapters were dissolved, and France had received the first bishop chosen in accordance with the Constitution—Expilly of Finisterre. In order to knit the priesthood the more closely to the Revolution it was determined on the 27th of November that every member of the clergy should take an oath, in which they not only promised obedience to the secular authorities and to the laws, but bound themselves to uphold the Civil Constitution to the best of their power. Once more the King delayed giving his signature, and on 3rd December he sent a fresh letter to Pius VI., in which, after describing the serious situation, he begged the successor of St Peter to put those alterations, which were inevitable, into canonical form.² It was courageous of the King to put off signing, but he could not do so for long. Already on 26th December—some time before an answer could have arrived from Rome—he was obliged to put his name to the decree of 27th November, and the oath was at once demanded of all the French bishops and priests.

This question of the oath divided the French priesthood into two parts: the jurors (*les assermentés, constitutionnels*), and the non-jurors (*les insermentés, réfractaires*).³ On 27th December, closely watched by the National Assembly, the Abbé Grégoire swore fealty to the nation, the laws, the King, and the Civil Constitution, in the belief that it was a matter which only concerned the outward polity, not the doctrine of the Church, and in the conviction that the Pope would have excommunicated Bishop Expilly and condemned the Constitution, if it had been heresy to conform to it. Between thirty and forty thousand priests took the oath in the period which

¹ Theiner, I, 18f.

² The letter is printed for the first time in Masson, 489. Theiner omits a good many of Louis' letters, especially such as are not to the King's credit.

³ De Pressensé, 137f. Sciout I, 398f.

followed,¹ but many other priests, and by far the greater part of the bishops, refused to do so. On 10th March and 13th April 1791, communications at length arrived from Rome, which showed that the non-jurors had rightly interpreted the silence of Pius VI.²

Probably not many people were impressed by the heavy artillery of patristic and canonical learning displayed in these briefs; but the reference to the King's coronation oath made Louis very anxious, and the threat that the Pope thought of taking strong measures, like those which his predecessors had used on similar occasions, no doubt strengthened the non-juring bishops and priests and many laymen in their resistance to the Civil Constitution. In the eyes of most of the faithful laity, the non-juring priests were the only true pastors. Already, at Easter, in 1791, Louis desired to escape to Saint-Cloud in order to avoid performing his Easter duties under the direction of a confessor who had taken the oath. But his carriage was stopped at the entrance to the Champs-Élysées, and he was obliged to return to the Tuileries. When he afterwards went to Montmédy with all his family, it was not only to avoid the tyranny of the citizens, but possibly still more to be able to confess to a non-juring priest.³ Doubtless it was also the Civil Constitution, and the demand that he should swear to it, which drove the King to make his unfortunate attempt at flight; and his flight led to a fatal breach between the monarchy and those clergymen who had taken the oath. Grégoire had in March 1791 been consecrated Bishop of Blois by Talleyrand, Gobel, and Miroudot, the reading of the papal Bulls and the usual oath of allegiance to the successor of St Peter being omitted.⁴ When it became known that the King had fled, Grégoire sent a pastoral letter to his priests in which he spoke of this unfortunate step as a new storm, which would bring the ship of the

¹ Gazier: *Études sur l'histoire religieuse de la révolution* (Paris 1887), 18. De Pradt thinks that the number was as high as 60,000.

² Theiner I, 32f., 57f. Mirabeau is reported to have said: "Les prêtres qui m'embarrassent ne sont point les réfractaires; ce sont ceux qui ont obéi à la loi du serment. Que ne le refusaient-ils tous! nous les aurions tous jetés au delà des Alpes." Gazier, 306, following the periodical *Chronique Religieuse* I, 128.

³ Gazier, 71f.

⁴ E. Méric: *Histoire de M. Emery et de l'église de France pendant la révolution* (Paris 1885) I, 243.

State all the sooner into port. He hoped that Louis would stay away for good, and would rather that the King had been sent on across the frontier, than brought back to Paris.¹

About three months after the King's flight, the National Assembly was closed (30th September 1791), and the Legislative Assembly began its meetings. Instead of loudly proclaiming liberty of conscience, as might have been expected, it made itself a party to the religious struggle, and betrayed its antagonism to Christianity at every point. As early as 29th November it issued a decree that all non-juring priests should forfeit their stipends, and somewhat later, on 6th April 1792, at the instance of a former Court Chaplain, Anastase Torné, who had become constitutional Bishop of Bourges, priests and bishops were forbidden to wear clerical dress. This prohibition, however, as we shall see, was constantly ignored. On 27th May the Assembly permitted the authorities of the departments to banish any priest, who was accused by twenty citizens of being a *perturbateur*. When Louis XVI. refused to sign the laws of 29th November 1791 and 27th May 1792, there was a violent outburst of popular fury against "Monsieur Veto." The King was first insulted on 20th June; then came the storming of the Tuileries on 10th August, and this led to the fall of the monarchy.

A few weeks later—26th August—a new law ordered all non-juring priests to leave the kingdom within fourteen days; "but the people were just as capable of mocking the laws as the legislators were of making them." Many of those priests, who would not take the oath to the Constitution, chose rather to live in hiding in France than to emigrate. There were laymen, who considered the churches desecrated by the services of those priests who had taken the oath, and they met in the churchyards, or in old, long forsaken chapels and meeting-houses, where non-juring priests held services. At Amiens the churchyard of Saint Denys was crowded every Sunday and feast-day with faithful Catholics, who heard Mass there with the double satisfaction of having not only remained faithful to the Pope, but also of exposing themselves to being persecuted for their faith.² There were non-juring priests all over France, who

¹ Gazier, 73.

² *Un séjour en France de 1792 à 1795*, par H. Taine (Paris 1895), 8, 48.

secretly baptized children and heard confessions. People often seized upon the most extraordinary means of meeting their religious wants. One lady gave a ball, and in a little chamber behind the ball-room a non-juring priest secretly heard the confessions of some of the guests.

The joy with which the dawn of the Revolution was greeted soon disappeared. An Englishwoman, who had seen the flush of victory in 1790, observed a great difference in 1792. The "honeymoon" was then over, and something like indifference was spreading to an alarming extent.¹ The unwise policy which had made of religion the flag of a party began to bear very different fruits from what the revolutionists had expected. Many people, who had not thought much about religion before, became ardent Papists when the support of the chair of St Peter had become the mark of a certain political creed. And many simple people soon lost their feeling even about "Bastille day" when they discovered that the Revolution meant death to the Church. In 1792 the English lady traveller asked an apple woman, who brought fruit every day, but stayed at home on 14th July, whether she sided with the aristocrats. "*Mon Dieu*, no," answered the poor woman; "it is not because I am an aristocrat or a democrat, but because I am a Christian woman."²

In the National Convention, which numbered among its members Grégoire and fifteen other bishops, who had taken the oath,³ there was, to begin with, a strong opposition to that anti-christian spirit; and it found voice at once. Cambon, who was one of the deputies, introduced a motion to free the nation from paying the expenses of Divine service and of the maintenance of priests, which had been proposed in the Legislative Assembly. But this met with opposition both within the Convention and without. Daubermesnil, who was by no means an adherent of orthodox Roman Catholicism, maintained that priests were useful to the Republic, because they preached love of the laws and obedience to the authorities, and kept the fire of liberty burning in the hearts of their fellow-citizens. Catholic citizens of Paris petitioned the Convention to retain the budget for public worship, and Grégoire, who on

¹ *Op. cit.*, 2.

² *Op. cit.*, 13.

³ Gazier, 97. De Pressensé, 288f.

30th November for the fifteenth and last time sat in the presidential chair, still wearing his episcopal dress, guided the stormy proceedings so well, that the session ended by deciding that the maintenance of Divine service, and of the clergy, should not be given up. But the waves ran high. Bazire declared that he would rather go to hell with Voltaire than to paradise with St Labre; La Planche, who himself had been a priest, said that next to kings priests were the most terrible scourges of mankind. Others, such as Danton, only wished to retain the priests until *officiers de morale* were obtained, who should instruct the people. But Philippe Druhle, who maintained that the clergy were in a position to spread the love of the Republic, was supported by Robespierre. In spite of the intrigues of the Paris Commune, and the threatening language of the revolutionary newspapers, the budget for public worship was not abolished that day; and when, on Christmas Eve 1792, at seven o'clock in the evening, after the lights in the churches were lighted, and the bells had begun to ring, the Council of the Commune gave orders that the places of worship were to be kept shut during Christmas night, there was a great uproar in the streets. The churches were besieged by crowds demanding that the priests should celebrate the solemn midnight Mass as usual.¹

Soon after having brought the budget for public worship happily through the purgatory of debate in the Convention, Grégoire went to Savoy and Nice to set in order church matters among the "Allobroges," who had likewise given themselves a Civil Constitution. When he returned to Paris in May 1793, he found the aspect of the National Convention quite altered. He, who was so good a republican that at first he could not sleep for joy at the thought of living in a republic, had always hoped "to christianise the Revolution"; but now he saw with sorrow, how in the course of a few months the hatred of Christ had quite gained the upper hand. He found the "majestic" assembly, which to the sound of the thunder of the Prussian batteries had founded the Republic, changed into a club, a sort of adjunct to the Jacobin club, and beheld it governed by two or three hundred people, "who were to be called criminals, because the language did not contain a more

¹ Gazier, 174f.

expressive word to describe them." In March 1793 the Convention had issued a severe law against those priests, who after emigrating dared to come back again to France. Later on, it determined that all members of the clergy who had not taken the oath of liberty and equality, as well as all priests who were accused of *incivisme* by five citizens of their canton, should be transported to Guiana. Finally, a price was actually set upon the heads of those priests who dared to carry on their work in secret. Anyone who informed against such a priest was to receive a hundred francs, and the person against whom the information was laid was to lose his life.¹

Even before this last law was published, the head of Saint-Sulpice, the Abbé Émery, who was sixty-one years of age, had been imprisoned on information given by persons in his native place. His trial carries the mind back to the procedure of the heathen officials against the early Christians of Rome.² But Christianity was not to be eradicated at this time any more than then. In prison the Abbé Émery continued to administer the sacrament of penance. One day Robespierre was told that in the conciergerie there was a highly-respected priest, who had heard the confessions of a great number of the prisoners. Instead of ordering him to the scaffold, Robespierre only answered: "Let him be! He shall not be condemned yet! He is a man who helps us; he gets people to go to their death without complaint. His day will come." So the Abbé Émery escaped the guillotine.

But these strict laws were often broken. A hundred and twenty priests, over sixty years of age, who had not taken the oath, and were imprisoned in Paris, with the connivance of their warders received frequent visits from the faithful, who sought consolation and religious aid from them.³ Religion had still power over the Parisians. On 9th May 1793 Dutard wrote to Garat: "This morning a priest in his canonical dress passed my door taking the holy sacrament to a sick person. You would have been astonished to see how the same people who persecute the ministers of the Church, both men and women, old and young, threw themselves upon their knees to

¹ Gazier, 188f.

² Méric: *Histoire de M. Émery* I, 342f.

³ *Un séjour en France*, 74.

worship.”¹ In spite of all the declamations of the members against Christianity, the Jacobin Club still did not venture to remove a wooden cross, which, in full sight of all, was fixed on one of the side galleries of their meeting-hall. In the country, where the Church was more deeply rooted, disobedience to the anti-religious laws of the Convention and loyalty to religion were still more manifest. The rising in La Vendée was due, in the first place, to indignation at the treatment of the Church by the Revolution, and only in a secondary manner to devotion to the monarchy.

But in the National Convention the anti-christian wave rose higher and higher.² In September 1793, when the Terror had conquered all its opponents, Atheism was solemnly proclaimed, and religious persecution systematically employed. A few months earlier, the Convention had rejected the demand for religious liberty as being dangerous to the Republic, because, as Robespierre said, religious freedom might lead to the formation of an alliance between “Superstition” and despotism; and Danton had prophesied that a time would come when the worship of Liberty would be the only religion of all Frenchmen. That time was now come. At that particular moment it was intolerable even to hear the word “religious liberty” mentioned. To the advanced spirits in the Convention, the difference between priests who had taken the oath and priests who had not had disappeared. One provincial club-orator even held that the readiness with which the oath had been taken by some was disastrous for France; because if all priests had refused to take it, “Superstition” could not have done so much harm in the country.³ Still the champions of liberty in the Convention had some hesitation in resorting to dragonnades; they preferred to employ actors as priests of “Reason” and “Morality” as a means of combating religion.

Meantime the blind hatred of Christianity shown by the members of the Convention and the Clubs served to give greater power to the Counter-Revolution. Maury, then Arch-

¹ A. Schmidt: *Pariser-Zustände während der Revolutionszeit* (Jena 1876) III, 221. Cp. H. Taine: *La Révolution* (Paris 1878) II, 390.

² De Pressensé, 314f. Gazier, 188f.

³ Speech of Citizen Lonqueue in the true Sansculottes' Club at Chartres, in Gazier, 194f.

bishop of Nicæa *in partibus*, in a memorandum to the Pope of 23rd June, does not conceal his bright hopes that the supremacy of the laws would soon be restored. "The progress of the Counter-Revolution," he writes, "grows day by day with a rapidity that soon may be incalculable."¹ The White Terror, however, for which Maury hoped, would have had no place for religious liberty. It can be seen from his expressions that it would only have been the philosophers, the Protestants, the Jansenists, and the Freemasons, who would have suffered for rebellion against the Church and the monarchy. But for the present the Red Terror was in power, and it stopped the mouths of the two and forty bishops and priests in the Convention who had taken the oath. One of them, however, Fauchet, dared to say that, fortunately for society, the extirpation of all religion is an absolute impossibility. As a punishment, he was made to mount the scaffold on 31st October 1793. Others of the forty-two were imprisoned; others again hid themselves, and at last Grégoire sat alone in the Convention, with his tonsure, and in a garb whose colour showed that he was and would continue to be a bishop.² When the Archbishop of Paris, Gobel, whose example was followed by several others, solemnly abjured his faith in order to show compliance with the will of the people, Grégoire rose and bore a Christian witness, which, in spite of the infernal howls that it called forth, really drew from the hearers greater respect than the coquetting of Archbishop Gobel with the red cap.³

Together with the old divine worship, the old calendar was abolished and France received a new republican calendar, which began with the equinox, 22nd September 1792, the day after the opening of the Convention. Decades were substituted for the weeks, and the place of the Christian festivals was taken by political, civil, and moral fêtes that were to *semer l'année de grands souvenirs* and thereby attach the rising generation to the Revolution.⁴ The eighteenth century showed

¹ Theiner: *Documents inédits* I, 381f. Cp. *Correspondance diplomatique et mémoires inédits du Cardinal Maury* I, 138.

² Gazier, 199f.

³ De Pressensé, 321f. Gazier, 207f.

⁴ Sicard: *L'éducation morale et civique avant et pendant la révolution*, 368f.

a great partiality for agriculture, the praise of which was spread abroad by its philosophers and its poets, and the new calendar was based upon *la sainte agriculture*, because, as Boissy d'Anglas explained, nature had made the French people a people specially adapted to farming.

Just as the new calendar was substituted for the old, a new form of worship was to supersede the Christian worship of God. In the choir of the church of Nôtre Dame, a temple was erected to Philosophy, and young girls in white sang Chénier's hymn, while an actress of light character sat on the altar as the "Goddess of Reason," decked with flowers. The provinces were not behindhand in this matter. In the course of twenty days,¹ no fewer than 2,346 French churches were transformed into "Temples of Reason," and when it was impossible to produce a "Goddess of Reason" on the spot, the members of the Convention for the locality supplied one, who by the help of theatrical garb and stage appointments was fitted up for "worship." Outside Paris also the attempt was often made at the festivals of the "Worship of Reason" to get some priest who, for the edification of his radical hearers, would denounce his faith and call Christianity a fraud.² But it must be said, to the honour of the French clergy, that it was very difficult to procure such priestly renegades. As a rule, a layman had to be dressed up in priestly garb to enact the comedy of apostasy. As might be expected, the people quickly became tired of this new worship, and the real Sansculottes had many scruples about stepping over the threshold of a church. In the report of Anacharsis Clootz, which was printed by order of the Convention, we read: "We Sansculottes need no other speeches than the Rights of Man, no other doctrines than the commands of the Constitution, and no other churches than the Clubs. . . . The intolerance of Truth will some day even forbid the word 'Temple' (*fanum*), because it is the root of the word 'fanaticism.'" In December 1793 there were still in Paris two or three small chapels in which services were held,³ and for some months these were thronged by great crowds. But the "intolerance of Truth" could not allow the Catholics of Paris even this much, and

¹ Gazier, 314.

² *Un séjour en France*, 160f.

³ Gazier, 218.

the little churches were closed. Such services were in the eyes of the Convention only an attempt "under the pretext of religion to betray the cause of liberty."¹

Before six months had passed, France was already tired of the new worship, and after Chaumette, Gobel, Anacharsis Clootz, and other high priests of the new goddess, had been guillotined, Robespierre made an end of the "Worship of Reason" by declaring on the 7th of May 1794 that the French nation believed in the existence of God and the immortality of the soul. The confession of the Savoyard priest became thereby the creed of France, and the place of atheism was taken by deism. The new festivals of "the Supreme Being" were celebrated in the open air, under the artistic conductorship of the famous David. The "temples" therefore were no longer of any use, and they were turned into storehouses, often after having been despoiled with barbarous violence. But the theatrical festivals of the Supreme Being also proved in the long run to be but poor substitutes for the old service, in spite of David's sense of colour and talent for grouping, and one after another men turned away with contempt and disgust from the liturgical inventions of Robespierre. "You are beginning to tire us with your Supreme Being," said one of the members of the Convention, after one of the long festivals on the Champs de Mars; and in the tribune of the Convention Chénier confessed openly that a solid foundation for the nation's morals had not yet been found.²

The 9th of Thermidor³ (27th July 1794) made no great change as regards religion; the Thermidorians were in reality just as good Terrorists as Robespierre. Carrier declaimed against the priests as people "who had grown old in the vices of a parsonage, in luxury, effeminacy, or prejudices." A former priest, who had taken the oath, was condemned to death in Paris by the revolutionary tribunal, because he had distributed "fanatical and counter-revolutionary," that is, religious books. In spite of the persecution, however, a good many of the priests

¹ Cp. the decree of Frimaire 16-18, in the year II, in Gazier, 222.

² "La morale populaire . . . cherche encore un point d'appui solide." Sicard, 407.

³ Up to 9th Thermidor, about 2,700 people had been guillotined; of these nearly 200 were priests and half of these had taken the oath; their crime was described as "fanaticism." Gazier, 218.

who had not taken the oath ventured to return to their country, some of them disguised as women; and the Convention was flooded with petitions for liberty of worship. The members of the Convention were informed in one of the petitions that crowds of harvesters, who in June 1794 were passing a church, had stopped outside to pray.¹ Another petition, in which Cicero, Plutarch, Voltaire, and Rousseau are quoted, says: "To annihilate the Christian religion in France is the same thing as to deprive the whole nation of its dearest and holiest treasure. . . . Legislators! restore the Catholic worship in France; give back to the French nation, your comrades in arms, their temples and their altars!" The Convention had at that time sanctioned the freedom of the Press, and it was hoped that religious liberty also would be obtained.

There were in the Convention three bishops who had taken the oath, who escaped with their lives through the Reign of Terror without renouncing their faith—Grégoire of Blois, Royer of L'Ain, and Saurine of Landes. Royer had, it is true, been imprisoned for a long time, and Saurine had been obliged to hide himself to escape the guillotine. At the earliest moment possible, these three bishops joined with citizen Desbois de Rochefort, Bishop of Somme, whom the Committee of Public Safety had just let out of prison, to work for liberty of worship, the restoration of Divine service throughout the Republic, peace amongst the divided priesthood, and association with the Holy See and foreign Churches.²

On 21st December 1794, Grégoire made a speech in the Convention in favour of freedom of worship.³ At first he was listened to with applause, afterwards his voice was drowned by shouts and hisses. He told the members of the Convention that there was religious liberty in Turkey but not in France, and he denied to his countrymen any right hereafter to speak scornfully of the Inquisition. He warned them against thinking it possible to have a Republic without religion, and claimed religious liberty as one of the rights of man; while he also predicted that a continuous refusal of the liberty of worship would end in a counter-revolution, make democracy hated, and sow discord in the land. He concluded by proposing to secure to all citizens the free exercise of their religious

¹ Gazier, 233f.

² *Ibid.*, 231.

³ Printed in Gazier, 341f.

services, so far as these did not violate order and the public peace.

The Convention did not hear Grégoire to the end, but passed on to the order of the day, and called loudly for the decades, and the festivals of Liberty, Prosperity, Stoicism, the Republic, Hatred of tyrants, and the rest. Since the liberty of the Press was greater than the liberty of the Tribune, the *Moniteur* and other papers were able to report fragments of Grégoire's speech with or without comment. The *Journal de Perlet* wrote thus: "Would the war in Vendée have been so terrible, if more tolerance had been shown in the rest of the Republic and in that district? . . . If you want peace in the land, you must treat all with justice, and allow every one to exercise his legitimate rights."¹ And in spite of the apparent defeat of Grégoire, his speech was a triumph for all religious Frenchmen. "Everybody is now talking," so writes the English lady-traveller on 23rd January 1795, "of the restoration of the churches and the reinstatement of the priests."² When Grégoire had his speech printed, that all might read both what he had said and what he had wanted to say, he received thanks and congratulations by the hundred.

In its anger the Convention passed a new and still more severe decree against the non-juring priests who ventured to return. But the courageous action of Grégoire had so effectually mooted the question of religious liberty that it could no longer be hushed and stifled. Even extreme Republicans³ now wished for religious liberty, because they feared lest "an usurper capable of conceiving and carrying out great designs" should use liberty of worship as a formidable instrument; and they recommended that this dangerous weapon, that might so easily be lifted against the Republic and the Revolution, should be done away with. There were other Republicans, however, who were of opinion that if once the Sunday were reintroduced, the festival of the "Three Kings" and the Kings themselves would soon follow after, and that there was an inner connexion between priesthood and kingship.

¹ Gazier, 245.

² *Un séjour en France*, 258f.

³ For instance Baudin, from whose work, written in 1795, Gazier quotes remarkable expressions, 248f.

The Convention had at last to give way to public opinion, and to decree liberty of worship. The reformed philosopher, Boissy d'Anglas, induced it on 21st February 1795 to pass a decree, which laid down that, while the Republic would not subsidise any form of worship, nor supply places for religious assemblies or for clergy to live in, the exercise of worship ought not to be interfered with, inasmuch as religious liberty was a right of man.¹ This decree was especially favourable to the priests who had not taken the oath, since they were as a rule connected with wealthy people, who were able both to find them their daily bread and to give them places to hold their services in. Afterwards a new decree of 8th June 1795 granted "temporarily" to the citizens and the *communes* the free use of the buildings, "that were originally intended for Divine worship"; but nobody could obtain permission to exercise any religious function without first promising to obey the laws of the Republic—a new "civil" oath, which gave rise to new troubles.²

After the issue of the decree of 21st February, Grégoire on 12th March sent a courageous pastoral letter to his clergy with a request to have it read on the first Sunday after its receipt in all parishes of the diocese.³ This pastoral letter travelled much further than the diocese of Blois; and the peculiar mixture of definite Christian faith with *civisme*, found in it, as in the speeches of Grégoire, did not fail of its effect. In a comparatively short time Divine service was set on foot all over France, a proof of the great attachment to the ancient Church, which the persecutions of the Convention had been able to repress, but not to eradicate. On 1st May 1795 Saint Médard was thrown open, the first of the churches in the capital; after the decree of 8th June, twelve of their ancient churches were handed over to the Parisians for service; and, finally on 11th August the keys of Nôtre Dame were delivered over, so that Divine service could be held in the church on 15th August—the Feast of the Assumption. But many of the French churches were in great need of restoration after the vandalism of the Revolution. Nôtre Dame had been a store-

¹ Decree of 3rd Ventôse in the year III, in Gazier, 255f.

² Sciout: *Histoire de la constitution civile du clergé* IV, 391f.

³ Printed in Gazier, 370-390.

house for wine casks, and the wind blew through the many broken window-panes and the loosely joined planks, which served for doors.¹ A band of Jansenists under the leadership of a barrister, Agier, formed meanwhile "a Catholic league," which among other things saw to the restoration of the churches, and joy at the re-opening of the sacred buildings manifested itself in great liberality amongst high and low.²

Grégoire and his friends were now able to work for the carrying out of their plans with good hope of success; and the honour of setting up again the altars of France belongs in reality more to the *assermenté* Bishop of Blois than to Bonaparte. Grégoire and his friends founded also, with sympathetic help from foreigners such as Scipione de' Ricci, a "Society for Christian Philosophy," which was to distribute useful books, and refute writings dangerous to the Christian faith. This society published several apologies, which were especially directed against the attacks on positive religion, by which Boissy d'Anglas had proved his philosophical republicanism, when he advocated the cause of religious liberty. A religious periodical was also published by Grégoire's party, called the *Annales de la religion*, which soon gained 1800 subscribers.³ The decades very soon lost their importance, and were succeeded by the Sundays; and even philosophers such as Fourcroy began to see that philosophy was mistaken, when it believed in the possibility of such a spread of enlightenment as to extirpate religious prejudices. He was of opinion that the people ought to be allowed to keep their clergy, their altars, and their worship, because these were a source of comfort to the many persons who are unhappy.⁴

Although the Civil Constitution had in 1793 been already suspended, it still cast its dark shadows over the regenerating work of Grégoire. He and the bishops who joined him exhorted all French Christians to avoid unprofitable strife, and to exert all their powers to edify and educate the people. But this exhortation was only followed in small degree. The different attitude in which those priests who had taken and

¹ *Un séjour en France*, 287f., 255.

² Séché: *Les origines du concordat* (Paris 1894) I, 142.

³ Gazier, 282f.

⁴ H. Taine: *Le régime moderne* (Paris 1891) I, 229.

those who had not taken the oath stood to the Civil Constitution pointed back to a deep political opposition, and at this critical moment, when an alliance of all good forces was so much needed, two religious parties were seen in sharp antagonism to each other, and religious fanatics condemned their opponents to eternal damnation. Those who had taken the oath, rallying round their bishops, had as their organ the *Annales de la religion*; those who had not taken the oath, formed a secret society, led by the vicars-general of the emigrated bishops, and the *Annales Catholiques* was the mouthpiece of their views.

Those who had taken the oath soon came to feel, like the German Old Catholics of our own days, that it is in the long run a doubtful advantage for a religious party to be helped by the State. The Civil Constitution was after all only a political, administrative measure, and the hand of the State soon proved itself a heavy hand. Behind those who had taken the oath there was a political power, which more and more betrayed its likeness to the Beast from the deep; behind the others was a pope, who at last was surrounded by the glory that radiates from martyrdom. Immediately after the bestowal of religious liberty, it became evident that the priests who had not taken the oath had more followers than the others.¹ And no wonder. The French nation was at bottom more in sympathy with monarchy than the philosophers and Sansculottes of the capital had imagined; and it was only the altar of those who had not taken the oath that would support a throne. Amongst the *assermentés* there was always discernible, as in the pastoral letter of Grégoire, a republicanism and a *civisme*, that was not to everybody's taste. It made an impression also upon many weaker souls, that the priests who had not taken the oath dared to attack so vehemently the work of the others, that they actually began to rebaptize and remarry those who had been christened and married by the constitutional ones. But this reckless attitude, and the Royalistic agitation, of which those who had not taken the oath were often guilty, stirred the wrath of the Convention, and in two new decrees precautions were taken against the non-juring clergy, who, as Grégoire wrote,² everywhere preached

¹ Sciout IV, 386.

² Gazier, 303.

rebellion against the laws of the Republic in the most disgraceful manner.

When, in October 1795, the National Convention was succeeded by the Directory, affairs were in a far better condition than when the Convention had succeeded the Legislative Assembly in the September of three years before. Mass was said in nearly 30,000 out of the 40,000 French parishes;¹ the Civil Constitution was set aside, and the bishops who had taken the oath declared that they were willing to retire and to do all they could in order to promote religious peace. There are many letters from bishops and priests who had taken the oath, which prove that in 1795 the writers were hoping for a reconciliation with the see of St Peter, but only on the basis of the Gallican propositions of 1682.²

The Directory seemed at first as if it would proceed still further in the path of tolerance upon which the National Convention had at last entered, but the awakening religious feeling, which everywhere manifested itself, roused the displeasure of the Directorial government, and led it to begin new persecutions. It soon became evident that too few churches had been handed over to the faithful, but instead of giving them any more, the Directory, which needed money, sold churches and abbeys, mostly for demolition. No fewer than one hundred churches were sold in Paris, and pulled down; the church at Cluny was levelled with the ground, and the cathedrals of Blois and Chartres would have suffered the same fate if they had not been bought by those who had taken the oath.³ Many parsonages were likewise put up for sale, and those which were not sold, were placed at the disposal of the municipalities as schools, in which the children were to be educated in the tenets of the Revolution, without any religious influence. The Directory annoyed priests and congregations by forbidding the ringing of bells, by attempts to hinder the keeping of Sunday sacred, and by demanding strict observance of the new calendar.

To crown its ecclesiastical policy, the new government

¹ In 1796 there were services in 32,214 parishes. Grégoire: *Histoire du mariage des prêtres en France* (Paris 1826), the preface V.

² Gazier, 307.

³ Séché: *Les origines du concordat* I, 120.

finally gave the Church a new rival in the so-called "Theophilanthropists," the "Friends of God and Man,"¹ whose apostle, Lareveillère-Lépeaux, was a member of the Directory. This new religion was a clumsy and stupid attempt to win religious Frenchmen to a new form of Divine worship on the basis of the deism of Rousseau. It was easy to see that the French nation needed religion and religious institutions, and in order to supply this want, Lareveillère-Lépeaux, or rather Valentin Haüy,² with the *naïveté* of the time of the Revolution, wished to invent a new philanthropic religion, just as the Abbé Sieyès in his days had invented a constitution.

The Theophilanthropists "honoured" a Supreme Being who rewards virtue and punishes vice. In praise of this Being, hymns were sung, and addresses were given at the Theophilanthropic meetings, which taught the duties of the man and the citizen. A sort of civil baptism was also introduced, which was a novelty in philanthropism as compared with Robespierre's festivals of the Supreme Being, and there were sponsors of both sexes who promised to educate the new citizen in the teachings of Theophilanthropism. A blessing on the flower-bedecked wedding couple was also introduced, and the wedding ceremony concluded with a hymn in praise of marriage as opposed to a "restless celibacy." And when death came, the Theophilanthropists gathered together in the "temple" round a painting, under which was written: "Death is the beginning of eternity," while the head of the family, who, as in the ancient North, was essentially the priest, gave utterance to reflexions on the shortness of life, and the immortality of the soul.

It was not difficult for the Directory by violence and persecutions to bring Christian Frenchmen once more into a time like that of the catacombs, but its favour could not breathe life into the still-born Theophilanthropism. At the very introduction of the Theophilanthropic worship into Paris, it was reported: "The meetings are not well attended. The new

¹ Grégoire: *Histoire des sectes religieuses* (Paris 1814), 89f. De Pressensé, 423f. Sicard: *L'éducation morale et civique pendant la révolution*, 448f.

² This appears from the newly published *Mémoires de Lareveillère-Lépeaux* (Paris 1895) I.—III., which Thiers and other historians of the Revolution read in manuscript.

cult does not seem destined to have a long career. The attention demanded is tiring; the workman needs diverting, and monotonous speeches send him to sleep." Even "diversions," such as the placing of a pair of tame doves on the altar during the celebration of a marriage, could not secure for the new religion any popularity. When Lareveillère-Lépeaux despondingly complained to Talleyrand of its small power to win its way, the former Bishop of Autun answered: "Jesus Christ died for His religion; you must do something similar for yours." After 1798, Theophilanthropism quietly disappears without leaving any visible traces behind it. It was, in fact, only a step on the ladder, by which the French nation worked itself up from the atheism of the worship of reason to the old faith.

To what degree the Church had revived in spite of the vexations and persecutions of the Directory, can be judged from the Council which met in Paris in August 1797, on the invitation of "the united bishops" who had taken the oath.¹ In the circular letter, which gave the invitation to the meeting, and which was signed by Grégoire, Royer, and Saurine, with three other bishops, the writers expressed first their devotion to the Pope, but then went on to say that the old church custom of holding councils was the best means of maintaining unity in faith, morals, and discipline. When the Council was opened on 15th August, in Nôtre Dame, seventy-two representatives were present from the whole of France, and amongst them no fewer than twenty-six bishops, and a bishop-elect who was not yet consecrated—just as many therefore as at the opening of the Council of Trent. Bishop Lecoz opened the meeting with a sermon, in which he described the scenes which those present had witnessed. "Simple peasants trembled for gladness merely at hearing the name of Jesus mentioned. The sight of the image of the Crucified made their countenances tremble for joy, after they had been sorrowful so long."²

After having deliberated for three months, partly in Nôtre Dame, partly in the chapel in the Hôtel de Pons, where lived Clément, the Bishop of Versailles, the meeting agreed upon a decree of peace (*décret de pacification*), which acknowledged

¹ Séché I, 137f.

² De Pressensé, 446f.

the Pope as the visible Head of the Church by divine right, but also demanded the maintenance of the principles and liberties of the Gallican Church (Articles I. and V.). If there were two bishops in one diocese, the one who was elected and consecrated before 1791 was to be the rightful bishop, but the other, elected and consecrated after that year, was to be the legitimate successor of the former. And the same rule was to obtain in parishes which had two priests (Article X.). This Gallican Council broke up with great expectations of peace in the Church, and before the parting in the choir of Nôtre Dame Grégoire had the pleasure of handing over to the assembly 1,000 francs which sympathetic Spanish Catholics had contributed towards defraying the expenses of the meeting. He was also able to read several letters, which proved how great was the sympathy with which the Church south of the Pyrenees followed the deliberations of the Council.¹

But only a minority of the bishops and priests who had not taken the oath looked with sympathy upon the Council of 1797. Its Gallicanism repelled many; and most of those who had not taken the oath had thrown in their lot with the Bourbons to such an extent that they declined to stand on an equal footing with the bishops and priests of the Revolution, who had not only sworn fealty to the Republic, but also hatred to the monarchy. After the *coup d'état* on the 18th of Brumaire, in place of the former oath, so irksome to many, was substituted a simple promise of loyalty to the Constitution (*je promets fidélité à la constitution*) and the *Moniteur* explained that in this promise there lay no declaration whatever of determination to maintain the Constitution, but only a promise not to oppose it.²

Those who had not taken the oath could make such a promise with a good conscience, and such a man as the Abbé Émery at Saint-Sulpice advised all to do so. Many, therefore, of those who had not taken the oath now returned to work in the Church. But the bishops who had emigrated would not acquiesce in even so slight a recognition of the Revolution as this; they hoped to work for the restoration of the old *régime* by resisting

¹ Séché I, 159.

² E. Méric: *Histoire de M. Émery* II, 10f.

at all points the new order of things in France. This was, in the opinion of the Abbé Êmery, the same as sacrificing religion for illusions,¹ and many agreed with him in this. Accordingly, Bonaparte, when he took in hand the arrangement of ecclesiastical affairs, encountered not only the old tension between those who had taken the oath and those who had not, but within the ranks of these last an antagonism between those who dreamt of a restoration of the order of things which preceded the French Revolution, and those who were willing to make peace with the new order, provided only that the reconciliation were sanctioned by the successor of St Peter.

¹ "On s'imagine par là," he wrote on 20th September 1800 (Méric II, 13), to the Abbé Romeuf, "ramener l'ancien régime : on se trompe et on sacrifie à des illusions la religion."

CHAPTER VII

PIUS VI

IN Italy also, and not least in the Papal States, the French Revolution caused great and violent alterations.

The Conclave which met in 1774 after the death of Clement XIV. had contained the same conflicting parties as the Conclave of 1769. The *Zelanti* were still sharply opposed to the cardinals belonging to the Crowned Heads; and they hoped for the restoration of the Jesuit order by means of a new pope of Jesuit sympathies, who might obtain support from a minister of one of the great Roman Catholic powers, friendly to the Jesuits. The Jesuit party had still enough influence to venture to remove the inscription on the monument of the late Pope, which spoke of his dissolution of the order; but it could not set Lorenzo Ricci free from his imprisonment in the Castle of St Angelo.

It was very difficult for the Conclave to agree.¹ The Spaniards would not acknowledge the candidates of the *Zelanti*, and the *Zelanti* refused those proposed by the Spaniards. The cardinals went into conclave in the Vatican on 5th October 1774; but at the beginning of the year 1775 there was still no prospect of coming to any agreement. A great many of the cardinals used in the evening to visit Cardinal Bernis in his cell—No. 46²—to pass the time, and enjoy the sweetmeats and fresh confectionery, which were sent into the Conclave every day from the hospitable cardinal's kitchen. For a time, Cardinal Colonna had obtained many votes, but there could be

¹ [Bourgoing]: *Mémoires historiques et philosophiques sur Pie VI. et son pontificat* (Paris 1793) I, 18f. Petruccelli della Gattina: *Histoire diplomatique des conclaves* IV, 211f. Masson: *Le cardinal de Bernis*, 300f.

² A plan of the Conclave in 1774 is to be seen in L. Lector: *Le conclave* (Paris 1894). Cp. the text, p. 317.

no question of his election ; he was only a man of straw, who was made use of until a real candidate could be found, and under the pious surface of the proceedings in the Conclave intrigues were carried on, as is usually the case, which were far from edifying. Time began, however, to pass heavily for the cardinals, and Bernis was longing to see his sick friend, the Princess of Santa Croce. When a piece of the wall round the Conclave fell down, the story was circulated that the accident was due to him, and that he had walked out through the opening to visit the princess.¹ Certain it is, that Bernis was tired of the incarceration, and he resolved to look out for a *Zelante* who would be sufficiently accommodating to the Bourbon Courts for the votes to converge upon him. Bernis' choice fell upon Braschi, the least dangerous of all the *Zelanti*. On 12th February he informed Braschi, that the Bourbons wanted a pope who, without giving any definite verbal or written promise before his election, would offer some hopes of confirming by a new brief or a bull the brief of Clement XIV. with regard to the abolition of the Society of Jesus ; who would either solemnly repeal the Bull of Maundy Thursday, or would at least consign it to oblivion ; and who would say nothing about any claims to Parma, Piacenza, and the Two Sicilies. Braschi considered that these wishes were reasonable, and he became Bernis' candidate accordingly. On the following evening Bernis settled with the future pope how the Secretaryship of State and other high posts were to be filled, and on 14th February he went the round of the cells in order to win over the Austrian and Spanish cardinals, who had scruples about giving their votes to Braschi. On 15th February the final voting took place, and Bernis' candidate received the votes of all the other cardinals.

Giovanni Angelo Braschi, of Cesena, who after some hesitation between Clement XV. and Benedict XV., chose to be called Pius VI., was a handsome man with a dignified demeanour and graceful movements. Everybody praised his rhetorical gifts and his ingratiating manner, but everybody knew also that he was beyond measure vain. When Luynes and Bernis, the two French cardinals, reported to their govern-

¹ Rivera in a despatch of 28th January 1775, Petruccelli della Gattina IV, 234. Cp. Masson 316f.

ment that the Conclave was ended, they described the new Pope as fifty-seven years of age, an honest nobleman without favourites, and morally pure and well educated; but the despatch ends cautiously with the following words: "God alone knows the heart, and men can only judge by appearances. The new Pope's manner of governing will show, whether, before his election, we saw his face or only his mask."¹

While the cardinals were in conclave, Rome had been flooded with satirical writings and pasquinades of the most offensive sort.² Several of them were burned on the Piazza Colonna by the executioner; but the scoffing did not cease because of that. The spirit of the eighteenth century had pervaded Italy also. Statesmen such as Firmian in Lombardy, Du Tillot in Parma, Rinuccini, Pallavicini and Gianni in Tuscany, Tanucci in Naples, Caracciolo and Simonetti in Sicily, were more or less under the influence of the French philosophy and the Gallican canon law. After the abolition of the Spanish dominion in Italy, a fresh current of thought passed through the peninsula, and the Spanish influence was succeeded by a strong influence from France. It was Voltaire, Rousseau, and the Encyclopædists, who took up the inheritance of Loyola and the stiff and gloomy Spaniards. When the Italian universities were reformed, after the expulsion of the Jesuits, they nearly all came into the hands of the men of free thought, and from them proceeded a strong opposition to the Church. The ruins of Pompeii, Herculaneum, and Pæstum, which were brought again to light, gave, like the discovery of ancient remains in the days of the Humanists, the impulse to a new humanistic paganism, and the discovery of several of the writings of Greek thinkers had an influence similar to that of the treasures of the Byzantine libraries when they reached the west in the latter part of the Middle Ages. The effect of the antique might be traced at the end of the eighteenth century in every branch of intellectual life, and not least in art, from architecture to the style of furniture and the very cut of people's clothes. Even the morals of antiquity were revived. "In the morning a short Mass, in

¹ Masson, 314, partly already in *Mémoires sur Pie VI.*, 29f.

² *Ibid.*, 307f.

the afternoon a game of basset, in the evening a sweetheart," said a Venetian proverb;¹ and the *Cicisbeati* undermined married life both in the higher and in the lower walks of life.

In spite of the fulminations of the Church Freemasonry flourished in Italy, and the *Illuminati* obtained not a few followers south of the Alps. A host of pamphlets appeared containing bold attacks upon the Church, the Pope, and the scholastic theology. As early as 1723 Pietro Giannone² had published his *Istoria civile del Regno di Napoli*, in which, without wishing to break with the Church, he scoffed at saints and indulgences, and adopted a critical attitude towards the miracle of the blood of St Januarius. Although his book was dedicated to Charles VI. and published with the permission of the Vicegerent, it was placed upon the Index as an offensive and seditious writing, full of affronts to all ecclesiastical authority, and especially to the see of St Peter.³ Two years later, another Neapolitan, Giambattista Vico,⁴ under the title: "Principles of a New Science regarding the Nature of Races," published a smaller but not less famous work; for in his *Scienza Nuova* Vico, although his views are based on defective historical and philosophical premises, yet—as Goethe said—gathered together with remarkable intuition all the historical points of view of former times into a "mighty unity," a philosophy of history, which is also rich in deep insight into the philosophy of language. The philosopher and political economist, Antonio Genovesi,⁵ the disciple of Leibnitz and Locke, proposed to Tanucci that theology should be banished from the University of Naples in order that history and physics might take its place; and in his lectures on Political Economy, delivered at Naples in 1755, and published in 1765, Genovesi spoke against the celibacy of the clergy and the right of the monasteries to own property, and maintained that the State had a right to confiscate the goods of the Church. He was called in consequence by his antagonists, such as Mamachi, an enemy of religion and the State. But

¹ Petruccelli della Gattina IV, 251.

² Settembrini: *Lezioni di letteratura Italiana* (Napoli 1872) III, 25f.

³ Reusch: *Index* II, 784f.

⁴ B. Fontana: *La filosofia della storia nei pensatori Italiani* (Imola 1873).

⁵ Settembrini III, 53f. M. Brosch: *Geschichte des Kirchenstaates* II, 9f.

in spite of all opposition of the Church, the Philosophy of Sense, which he advocated, made great progress amongst the Italian youth.

An anti-religious spirit appeared also amongst lawyers like Gaetano Filangieri and Cesare Beccaria; and Metastasio mentions that in his youth there was an *ardente falange anti-Vaticana* of Neapolitan jurists.¹ Filangieri not only wished to wrest the schools from the guardianship of the Church, but according to his view the State ought also to watch over the education of priests. Although Beccaria, "to escape the bonds of superstition and the howls of fanaticism," resolved to conceal the full significance of his message in a cloud of words, his book *Dei delitti e delle pene* contained a crushing condemnation of the Inquisition and of torture, and with this famous book a new era commenced in criminal law, which was more needed in Italy than anywhere else. Natural science received a new impetus from the discoveries of Volta and Galvani, and in Italy, as elsewhere, contempt for the Church and Christianity became for many the first result of the reviving study of the forces of Nature.

It was thus in a society deeply rent by humanism and scepticism that Pius VI. took over the inheritance of St Peter, in the secret hope of regaining for the Papacy the tried support of Jesuitism. The favourites of Clement XIV. soon learned that the new Pope did not approve of the church policy of his predecessor; and although Pius VI. at first proceeded with the greatest caution, it was soon discovered what was the most ardent wish of this *Zelante*. In spite of the eagerness of Spain to have Bishop Juan de Palafox² placed among the Blessed, Pius VI. delayed the process of beatification, and at last it was stopped by an imperative message from the Pope in 1777; it was asserted that the correspondence of that enemy of the Jesuits with the theologians of Louvain had given the *Advocatus diaboli* plenty of ground for assailing his orthodoxy.³ On the other hand, Pius VI. dared not, especially out of regard for Spain, to open the gates of the Castle of Sant' Angelo for Lorenzo Ricci; but when, as Bernis wrote home,⁴ "Providence ordered

¹ Settembrini III, 25.

² See p. 74.

³ *Mémoires sur Pie VI.* I, 39f.

⁴ Masson, 326.

things so well" that the Jesuit General died (24th November 1775), his imprisoned assistants were immediately released.

Before the death of Ricci, Pius VI. had already entered upon secret negotiations with Frederick II. regarding the Jesuits. Bernis reported to his government in October 1775 that the Prussian king, who had no envoy in Rome, had been negotiating with the Pope by means of a certain Abate Ciofani, who was much attached to the Jesuits. The headquarters of the negotiations was not Rome, however, but Warsaw, where Garampi, one of the allies of the Jesuits, was nuncio.¹ The brief of Clement XIV. inhibited such Jesuits as would not acknowledge the dissolution of their order from the performance of all priestly offices; but Pius VI. allowed Garampi to give permission to the bishops of Silesia and Prussian Poland to grant the Jesuits the right to minister in spite of refusing obedience to the brief. For Frederick II., in spite of the brief of dissolution, looked upon the Jesuits in Prussia as a lawful society; the Prussian Jesuits received novices as usual, and they thought of electing a new General after the death of Ricci, but contented themselves with a vicar-general for Silesia. Pius played a double part, inasmuch as openly, out of regard for the Bourbons, he spoke against the contumacy of the Prussian Jesuits, whilst secretly he approved of it.

In June 1776 it was even rumoured, that there had been issued, from the Secretariate for Memorials, which was managed by Rezzonico, the friend of the Jesuits, a rescript whereby the ex-Jesuits obtained permission to use the office peculiar to their society, "as if the Pope still considered the society as in being." France and Spain, however, made strong representations; and Tanucci declared on behalf of Naples that that kingdom would not hereafter in the usual solemn way deliver to the Pope, on the Feast of St Peter and St Paul, the customary tribute consisting of a white steed and ten thousand Roman gulden. It was no small grief to the vain Pope, who liked to seize upon every opportunity of appearing in full splendour, to be obliged to renounce the imposing scene, and in order to appease the Bourbon Courts he cancelled the rescript to the ex-Jesuits. Bernis was so pleased with this compliance

¹ Masson, 330f. Cp. Brosch II, 141, where there are fragments of Venetian despatches.

that he confidently wrote home: "If this Pope should be so foolish as to work for the revival of the Society, he will meet with a general and unsurmountable opposition from the Courts, whether they be enemies or friends of the Jesuits."¹

But towards the end of the year 1776, fate was indeed extraordinarily kind to the disciples of Loyola. Just when the Bourbon Courts began to draw together for a joint resistance to the double game of Pius VI., important changes took place in political circles. Tanucci at Naples was succeeded by the Marquis de la Sambucca; Don Jose Moniño was recalled to Madrid to become the premier of Spain; in this way he became occupied with other matters than keeping an eye on the friendliness of Pius VI. towards the Jesuits; and Pombal in Portugal fell into disgrace. Thus there disappeared at one moment from the political arena three of the most formidable opponents of the Jesuits; and Bernis was quite prepared to see the Queen of Portugal, who after the fall of Pombal seemed inclined to turn her court into *une véritable capucinière*, make up her mind to demand the re-establishment of the Society of Jesus.

Under such circumstances the ex-Jesuits took fresh heart, and in Catherine II. of Russia they found a well-wisher, who was able greatly to befriend them.² The two hundred and one Jesuits in White Russia and Lithuania were among the first to take the oath of fealty to the Empress, and this procured for their superiors the most friendly reception when later on they met in St Petersburg to do homage to Catherine. When the brief of Clement XIV. was issued, Tchernichef, the Governor of White Russia, who was a friend of the Jesuits, prohibited under most heavy penalties the introduction of Roman decrees into Russia. The Russian Jesuits therefore were able to act as if the brief *Dominus ac redemptor noster* did not exist. It is said that they asked Catherine's permission to obey the bidding of the Pope, but that the Orthodox Empress replied that she wished to keep the Society of Jesus as it was. No doubt their petition was more or less of a pretence, and the reply of the Empress was scarcely unwelcome to them.

¹ Masson, 334.

² Cp. Masson, 337f., mainly following: *La compagnie de Jésus conservée en Russie après la suppression de 1773. Récit d'un Jésuite de la Russie Blanche* (Paris 1872), and: *Un Nonce du Pape à la cour de Catherine II. Mémoires d'Archetti* (Paris 1872).

So zealous was Catherine II. for the welfare of the Jesuits, that she begged Garampi to consecrate a convert named Stanislaus Siestrzencevicz, who had been educated as a Calvinist, to be Bishop of Mallo *in partibus*, that he might become apostolic visitor in White Russia. Before his consecration Siestrzencevicz solemnly promised the Empress to allow the Jesuits to live as heretofore. Thus Russia became an asylum for all the Polish, German, and Italian Jesuits. The Bishop of Mallo took upon himself to ordain to the priesthood a number of Jesuit *scholastici*. In later times writers on the Jesuit side, mainly relying upon a letter attributed to the former Polish minister, the Marquis Antici, have asserted that the Russian Jesuits on these points acted under the sanction of the Pope.¹

A great deal of what we now know about the state of affairs in Russia was unknown to the diplomatists of those days. In his relations with these, Pius VI. continued his ambiguous policy. His constant excuse was that he had no power either over a Protestant prince like Frederic II., nor over a schismatic like Catherine. But Bernis was at his post. As soon as he heard that the Marquis Antici—whom he calls “the ecumenical minister,” in reference to the many Courts he had served since he had been in Poland—had obtained a brief permitting the ex-Jesuits at Cologne to live in community, and to teach and preach, he sounded such an alarm that the brief, which was already issued, was torn to pieces in his presence.² But in Russia the Jesuits continued their activities, and Rome did not desist from its double game. As Bernis wrote to his government, it was not displeasing to the Pope that “seed of the Jesuits” should be preserved in remote countries,³ and with the sanction of Catherine II. the Russian Jesuits, on 9th October 1782, elected Father Stanislaus Czerniewicz as vicar-general with the authority of General.⁴

This was open rebellion against the brief of Clement XIV., and the step taken by the Russian Jesuits caused the greatest

¹ S. Sanguinetti: *La compagnie de Jésus et son existence canonique dans l'église* (Paris 1884), 406f. The letter is without name, but, says S., “on reconnaît aisément la façon d'écrire du marquis Antici.”

² Masson, 345.

³ *Ibid.*, 358.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 365.

indignation, both at Versailles and at Madrid. But help against the rebels was not to be expected from Pius VI. Already, in April 1780, he is supposed, in conversation with Cardinal Calino, to have called the dissolution of the Society of Jesus "a true mystery of iniquity," and to have promised to seize the first opportunity for its re-establishment, maintaining that Clement XIV. was not in full possession of his mental faculties, either before or after the dissolution,¹ and just when the representatives of France and Spain in Rome were urgent to wring from Pius VI. a disapproval of the doings of the Russian Jesuits, Catherine II. informed him that in that case she would deprive all her Roman Catholic subjects of the free exercise of their religion.²

That this threat might not be carried into effect, Pius VI. made haste to satisfy all Catherine's wishes, but he sent at the same time to the Kings of France and Spain a brief which solemnly confirmed the brief of dissolution, and condemned the conduct of the Bishop of Mallo, as far as it was at variance with that brief.³ If this new brief had been published, the duplicity of Pius VI. would have been patent to everybody, but the new Spanish representative at Rome, Florida-Blanca, partly out of respect for Russia, and partly out of attachment to the Pope, deemed it best to put off the publication. It became possible therefore for Pius VI. to continue his perfidious policy. Soon after, in March 1783, the Bishop of Mallo, who in the meantime had become Archbishop of Mohilev, sent his coadjutor to Rome to request, in the name of the Empress,⁴ the Pope's recognition of the doings of the Jesuits in White Russia. Pius VI. told Bernis that he had expressed to this coadjutor his serious disapproval of the former Bishop of Mallo's conduct,⁵ but the coadjutor himself swore, two years afterwards, that the Pope in reality had thrice repeated to him: *Approbo Rossos Jesuitas!*⁶

¹ Sanguinetti, 395f.

² Masson, 365.

³ The Brief (29th January 1783) says: "Improbantesque illa Mallensis acta, quæ Apostolicis fel. rec. Clementis XIV. Prædecessoris nostri in forma Brevis literis die 21 Julii 1773 datis adversarentur." Theiner: *Clementis XIV. Epistole et Brevia* 379.

⁴ "Ce qui Siestrzencevicz a fait en faveur des Jésuites, il ne l'a pas fait de sa propre autorité; mais par l'ordre de Catherine II. elle-même." *Mémoires d'Archetti*, 20 and 126.

⁵ Despatches of 4th and 12th March 1783. Masson, 367.

⁶ Masson, 367, following *La compagnie de Jésus conservée en Russie*, 98. In connexion with the preceding, see also Count D. Tolstoy: *Romanism in Russia* (London 1874) I, 328.

Shortly after this, there were one or two incidents at Rome, which showed how completely Pius VI. had become by degrees the slave of Jesuitism. A French beggar, Benoît Joseph Labre, from a village in the diocese of Boulogne-sur-mer, who had lived nine years in Rome, died on 16th April 1783. At once it began to be said that he was a saint. The Romans spoke with enthusiasm about his holy uncleanliness and his long prayers at the church doors. It was soon reported also that he had worked miracles and had entrusted his confessor with important prophecies.¹ This confessor, Marconi, who wrote his life, was an ardent adherent of the Jesuits, and Bernis saw at once that the Jesuit party was at the back of this enthusiasm for Labre, which was turning the superstitious and ignorant city upside down. The excitement cooled somewhat, when a letter from Labre was found in France, in which he recommended the reading of the works of the Jansenist Oratorian, Père Lejeune, and at the same time it was discovered at Rome, that Labre was accustomed to get good food and drink at an *osteria*, so that doubts began to arise with regard to the severity of his asceticism. Furthermore, Marconi, who called himself with pride his confessor, had in reality only heard his confession twice.²

After these discoveries, the ex-Jesuit, Zaccaria, thought it prudent to drop that sketch of the holy man's life which he was engaged in writing; but fanaticism and enthusiasm could not be restrained by critical researches. It was said that Labre had worked miracles, not only at Rome, but in France as well, and Pius VI. interested himself in the slandered saint. In defiance of the remonstrances of Bernis, he put everything in train for the process of beatification; and in the very middle of the Revolution, on 31st March 1792, when Bernis was no longer able to watch his actions, he began the apostolic "process," and declared Labre the Venerable. It was a triumph for the Jesuits; and although both they and the Pope soon had other matters to think of than

¹ One of the most trustworthy sources for the life of Labre is Bernis' despatches of the year 1783. They are collected in Appendix XIV. to Saint-Priest's *Histoire de la chute des Jésuites*, 335-345. See also *Mémoires sur Pie VI.* I, 74f.

² Despatch of Bernis, 19th July 1783, Saint-Priest, 340f.

processes of beatification, the French beggar was not forgotten. On 20th May 1861, he was beatified, and on 8th December 1881, Leo XIII. canonised him.

In 1792, when the process of Labre's beatification was set in motion, the re-establishment of the order of Loyola was also seriously considered.¹ It was thought that the unbelieving philosophy would hardly have gained so many conquests if the order had not been suppressed. Even a diplomatist like Aranda, the Spanish representative in Rome, who formerly had been very fierce against the Jesuits, now hoped to find in the re-established order an ally against the Revolution. But it was still too soon to call for "the strong and well-tried pilots"; only in the atmosphere of a general European reaction could the solemn re-establishment of the hated order be spoken of. Pius VI. had to be satisfied with such triumphs as the recantation of Febronius, and the victories over the Electors at Ems and the Bishop of Pistoja, and, as we have seen, even those victories were crossed by bitter humiliations.

The home government of Pius VI. was fairly energetic, but not successful.² Clement XIV. had endeavoured to effect a balance in the budget by diminishing his expenses. Only when enterprises of general utility or of science were in question, was he liberal. But Pius VI. was anything but economical. He endeavoured by a new fiscal system, and in other ways, to obtain larger revenues for the papal treasury. Still it was much easier to reduce the expenditure than to increase the revenue, and the new taxes created much discontent. The Jubilee year of 1775 did not bring, as in the Middle Ages, a flood of gold pieces to Rome; but it gave Pius the opportunity to exhibit himself often in splendid attire, and to elicit from the many spectators admiration for his fine hands and his small feet. "*Quanto è bello!*" was the exclamation that usually met him on the part of the Roman women, but with the addition, more flattering for a pope, "*Tanto è bello quanto è santo!*"

The most debated of all Pius VI.'s civic enterprises was the draining of the Pontine marshes.³ Many were enthusiastic

¹ See Ant. Capello's despatch of 28th April 1792, in Brosch II, 189.

² Brosch II, 144f.

³ *Mémoires de Pie VI.* I, 125f, and Brosch II, 150f.

about this undertaking, but the enthusiasm soon subsided. It became evident that Pius VI. had wished, by carrying out his project, to gain the reputation of an engineer, without having any of the qualifications. Before one third of the marshes had been converted into dry ground, all the money which the whole undertaking should have cost was used up. It had been expected that the arable land so reclaimed would in a short time repay the cost of drainage; but this hope failed completely. The Romans were scandalised when Pius VI. gave to a relation of his, who already called himself "Duke" Braschi, the reclaimed land in perpetual lease. It looked like an anachronistic attempt to get a principality for a pope's nephew.

The draining of the Pontine marshes was by no means the only enterprise that exhausted the papal treasury and brought the finances of Pius VI. into hopeless disorder. The Renaissance ideas floating in the air of Rome had infected him. He desired to carry his name down to posterity as a builder. The architect, Carlo Marchionne, was bidden to make plans for a sacristy for St Peter's. When completed, this sacristy was not as large as Pius had thought it would be; but, as it stands, with its three magnificent apartments, adorned with dazzling splendour, it cost more than 1,500,000 Roman gulden. The pompous inscription above the main entrance, which announces to coming generations that it was erected according to the wish of the people (*publica vota*), must not be taken too literally. A few days after it was set up, the following disavowal could be read underneath it:—

"Publica ! mentiris. Non publica vota fuere,
Sed tumidi ingenii vota fuere tui."¹

The Romans had quickly seen through the vainglorious Pope, who never omitted to mark any statue or work of art which he had himself added to the collections of the Vatican with the words: *Munificentia Pii Sexti*, and who in the so-called *Museo Pio-Clementino* has erected the finest monument to his *munificentia*.

With the French Revolution began the great humiliations of

¹ *Mémoires de Pie VI.* I, 94.

Pius VI. In Austria it was believed that he was at the bottom of the disturbances in Tuscany and the insurrection in Belgium, which latter—like a prophecy of that covenant between Ultramontaniam and Liberalism, which later on was struck in Belgium—was in fact led by the Archbishop of Malines and a Liberal advocate. If Pius VI. really played with the revolutionary fire in Tuscany and Belgium, he was cruelly punished for it by all the disasters which the French Revolution and its sequel brought upon his head. We have seen what horror the Civil Constitution of the clergy and the occupation of Avignon and Venaissin created in Rome. During the days of the Directory misfortunes came still closer home to the Papacy.

Shortly after France became a Republic, the French diplomatist, Hugou de Bassville, who had been sent to Rome in November 1792 to discover the weak points in the papal government,¹ had the Bourbon *fleur-de-lis* removed from the post office, and from the Palazzo Mancini, where the French Academy had its home; and later on the statue of Louis XVI. in the Academy was thrown down. The papal Secretary of State informed Bassville at once that his master did not approve of displacing the *fleur-de-lis* in favour of the device of the "so-called" Republic. The ill-will towards France in certain circles was very great. When the French diplomatist, with some countrymen of his, drove down the Corso on 13th January 1793, his carriage was attacked in the Piazza Colonna by a crowd of people, who seem to have been set on by one or two abbés, and Bassville was mortally wounded.² The circle of French artists, who had their place of resort in the Academy at the Palazzo Mancini, and whose sympathies were with the Revolution, were greatly exasperated by his death; and the exasperation was not less in Paris. The *Moniteur* spoke about laying the Vatican in ashes; and notwithstanding their many anxieties at home and abroad, the Parisians did not forget to demand revenge upon the murderers of Bassville.³

On 26th April 1796 General Bonaparte issued from his headquarters at Cherasco a proclamation, in which he called

¹ F. Masson: *Les diplomates de la révolution* (Paris 1882), section: *Hugou de Bassville à Rome*, 13f.

² *Ibid.*, 84.

³ *Ibid.*, III.

upon his victorious troops to carry liberty, not only to Turin and Milan, but also to Rome, "where the murderers of Bassville are still trampling on the ashes of those who vanquished the Tarquins."¹ On 15th May he made his entry into Milan; and on 19th June he came to Bologna, where already in 1794 some young Italians had endeavoured to raise an insurrection, and had decked themselves with the Italian tricolour, formed of the white and red colours of Bologna, together with the green of hope. Immediately upon the arrival of Bonaparte the Senate of Bologna took the oath of fealty to the French Republic, and in the course of a short time Ferrara, Ravenna, Imola, and Faenza were in the power of the French. Everywhere in the conquered places the Pope's coat of arms was taken down, and trees of liberty were planted; and Bonaparte was preparing to go through Romagna and the Marches to Rome, to take revenge for Bassville.

In his hour of need Pius VI. besought the Tuscan statesman, the Marchese Manfredini, as the servant of a neutral power, to go to Bologna and make an attempt to stop the advancing enemy.² With Manfredini went Lorenzo Pignotti, who hoped to win the heart of Bonaparte by using in honour of the young commander a stanza of Tasso's about Godfrey of Bouillon. But neither the words of Manfredini nor the verse of Tasso made any impression on the victorious warrior. The Spanish representative in Rome, Don Jose d'Azara, who next attempted to incline Bonaparte more favourably towards the Pope, was not more successful.³ When D'Azara proposed to let Pius VI. off with paying four or five million *lire* for expenses of war, Bonaparte became furious, and called it an insult to the French nation to imagine that its enemy could get off so cheaply. He gave such free course to his ill-humour that at last D'Azara withdrew to his apartment, shedding tears of shame.⁴ On 23rd June 1796 it came at last to a very burdensome truce for Rome.⁵ Besides the cession of Bologna and Ferrara, it laid upon the

¹ *Correspondance de Napoléon I.* (Paris 1858) I, 219.

² A. von Reumont: *Geschichte Toscanas* II, 270f.

³ Pius VI.'s memorandum of 12th June 1796 in Séché I, 181. The reader will there find a reproduction of D'Azara's diplomatic papers, from the archives at Alcalá.

⁴ H. von Sybel: *Geschichte der Revolutionszeit* (Düsseldorf 1870) IV, 203f, following the statement of Belmonte.

⁵ *Correspondance de Napoléon I.* I, 527f.

Curia heavy compensation for the family of Bassville. Five hundred valuable manuscripts and a hundred works of art were to be delivered over, besides provisions to the value of five and a half million *livre*, and a war indemnity of fifteen millions and a half.

To arrive at an agreement about the final conditions of peace, Pius VI. sent Count Pierracchi to Paris. The Papal representative could not expect to find much good-will on the part of the Directory. Carnot was the only one of the Directors who did not wish to see a Roman republic raised on the ruins of the Papacy. For Lareveillère-Lépeaux the successor of St Peter was a rival; Catholicism was the successful competitor with Theophilanthropism. And Rewbell had the genial idea, that if it was not possible to get rid of the Papacy altogether, it would be well to get two or more popes at once, so that republicans, and royalists, and the various States, might have one apiece; only care must be taken that the Pope of the French Republic should dwell at Rome.¹

To appease the men of the Revolution, Pierracchi brought with him a brief to all faithful Catholic Christians dwelling in France and in communion with the Papal See.² In this letter, Pius VI. appealed to the recipients to keep the peace and to show due submission to the powers that be, reminding them that the Roman Church, like St Paul, teaches that authority is from God. It was the first time that Pius VI. had spoken in this way with reference to the French Republic; and the letter caused great irritation among the Roman *Zelanti*, who maintained that obedience could only be demanded for legitimate authorities, and never for usurping ones. Most of the priests who had taken the oath to the Constitution disseminated the letter with joy, as a proof that they had acted correctly; but some of them, more clear-sighted than the rest, had some misgivings with regard to the form in which the address was couched, and also as to certain expressions in the letter itself. Those who had not taken the oath were as dissatisfied with it as the *Zelanti* at Rome.

¹ Séché I, 34, after one of Rewbell's despatches in connexion with the approaching Conclave.

² Séché I, 20. The address in the French translation is as follows: "A tous les fidèles du Christ, catholiques résidant en France, qui sont en communion avec le Saint-Siège apostolique."

On 26th July Count Pierracchi was presented by the Spanish representative in Paris, the Marquis del Campo, to the French Foreign Secretary, Delacroix ; but it was not till 12th August that negotiations began. Delacroix at once rode the high horse, and informed Pierracchi that it would be the easiest thing in the world for France to change all the principalities of Italy into revolutionary states.¹ The first demand of Delacroix on behalf of the Directory was a distinct and explicit withdrawal of all the violent and contemptuous expressions that the Pope had used in bulls and briefs with regard to the French Revolution. The above-mentioned brief to the faithful Catholics in France was in Delacroix's view inadequate ; and as the Foreign Secretary and Pierracchi could not agree about an altered drafting of the article referring to the withdrawal of earlier bulls and briefs, the negotiations were hastily broken off. On 23rd August the Papal envoy received orders to leave Paris at the earliest possible moment, together with his Secretary of Legation, because it had been clearly shown that he had not sufficient authority to make the requisite submission.² After the victory of Bonaparte over General Wurmser and the Austrians, the Directory thought that there was no need to wait so long a time as would elapse before Pierracchi could get the necessary instructions from Rome. It was much simpler to entrust to the victorious General of the army in Italy the duty of negotiating directly with the Pope.

While the peace negotiations were in progress, it seems that there were also negotiations tending to nothing less than the conclusion of a new Concordat with Rome. If we may venture to believe the memoirs left by the Papal Nuncio at Paris during the Revolution, Mgr. de Salamon, which were published a few years ago by the Abbé Bridier, Pierracchi played also the part of second to Salamon in conducting confidential negotiations for a Concordat.³ Mgr. Salamon says : " The Directory made many concessions in order to

¹ The Marquis del Campo's despatch to D'Azara, 13th August 1796. Séché I, 30f.

² " Cette latitude de pouvoirs dont elle [Sa Sainteté] ne pouvait se dissimuler la nécessité." The letter and the decree of expulsion are given in Séché I, 47.

³ *Mémoires inédits de l'internonce à Paris pendant la révolution* (Paris 1890), 234f.

induce His Holiness to confirm the Civil Constitution of the clergy. Half of the old bishops were to have been recalled, and restored to their former sees, and half of the bishops who had taken the oath were to have been retained. When an episcopal see was vacant, the Directory was to propose three persons, of whom the Pope was to select one." The draft of this Concordat, according to Mgr. Salamon, was actually printed; but when a further oath was demanded from the bishops and priests, Pius VI. peremptorily rejected it.

These negotiations for a Concordat have hitherto been altogether unknown, and men as much at home in those times as Boulay de la Meurthe, who edited the documents relating to the history of the actual Concordat, are very sceptical with regard to the revelations of the Papal Nuncio. It is certainly an extraordinary thing that this attempt to make a Concordat does not seem to have been mentioned at all at the conclusion of the Concordat of 1801. Silence with regard to the negotiations in 1796 can perhaps be explained by the fact that Rome did not feel inclined to take up former negotiations which were based upon a partial recognition of the bishops who had taken the obnoxious oath, and of the Civil Constitution. Besides this, Rome in 1801 stood face to face with a different government from that of 1796. From other sources¹ we learn that Pierracchi brought with him two cardinals' hats, of which the one seems to have been destined for Grégoire, the other for Bishop Saurine, who also had taken the oath.² It is, furthermore, a fact that Pierracchi during his three or four weeks' stay in Paris had dealings with the bishops of that party, who were on friendly terms with Carnot.³ Salamon's account, therefore, is not wholly untrustworthy, but we are for the present unable to check the details of his story. Only so much is certain that he was disposed to over-rate his own importance; and it is difficult to believe that the Directory really intended to make a Concordat with Rome, even on the basis of a partial acceptance of the Civil Constitution. Possibly it was a case in which Carnot acted on his own account.

At Rome hopes were entertained of escaping the humiliating conditions of peace by gaining time. When D'Azara

¹ Gazier, 127.

² Cp. p. 155.

³ Séché I, 41.

returned from Bologna he was received as a deliverer; but he was little edified by the state of things in the city of St Peter. He was scandalised by the endless processions, and by the streams of people who visited images of the Madonna that opened and shut their eyes. In spite of his devotion to the Pope, this Spanish nobleman was a child of the eighteenth century. When Miot, the French ambassador to Tuscany, and some other French agents, came to Rome, by Bonaparte's orders, to enforce the conditions of the armistice, there were frequent scenes in the streets. The Pope and the inhabitants of Rome were compelled to part with their art treasures; and there was such eagerness in Paris to get hold of them that the notion was entertained of offering Pius VI. a famous old image of St Anne from a Carmelite monastery at Auray in exchange for this or that object of art.¹

As soon as Wurmser crept forward, the English-Neapolitan party took courage again, and Pius VI. determined to make an attempt to induce Bologna and Ferrara to throw off the French yoke. But the appeal which he sent to the Senate of Bologna was immediately despatched to Bonaparte by the Senate itself, and the Archbishop of Ferrara, Cardinal Mattei, who had gone to Ferrara, in spite of the armistice, to refix the Papal coat of arms, soon became the prisoner of Bonaparte. After Wurmser's defeat the Cardinal-Archbishop was arrested and conveyed to Brescia, and Pius VI. received a sharp admonition to keep better order in his capital, so that French citizens there might not be exposed to ill-treatment. At this juncture, Pierracchi returned to Rome with the proposal of the Directory that the expressions in former bulls and briefs derogatory to the Revolution should be withdrawn. The cardinals, who were immediately called together, declared it to be impossible for the Pope to accede to this request,² but D'Azara induced the Dominicans of Maria sopra Minerva and their General, who was a Spaniard, to deliver an elaborate opinion, which attempted to prove that the request of the Directory, when rightly understood, was not injurious to the doctrine of the Church. Furnished with this theological judgment, D'Azara went to the Pope, but the acumen of the Dominicans was

¹ Sécché I, 57.

² *Ibid.*, 60f.

not appreciated by him. He declared to D'Azara that this question was settled, and that he intended, by the advice of the cardinals, to leave Rome. Preferably he would go to Spain; but as D'Azara did not dare to encourage the execution of this plan without the permission of his sovereign, he spoke of a retreat to Malta. He had already asked the English Admiralty to place one or two ships at his disposal, that he might safely reach that place of security. He also requested D'Azara once more to do the Papacy the favour of accompanying the Papal negotiator, Mgr. Galeppi, from Rimini to Florence, where he was to meet the French commissioners.

The moment D'Azara was out of Rome, Pius VI. summoned the unfortunate Dominican General, and charged him with having done incalculable harm to the dignity of the Pope, the Papal States, and the whole Church of God, by his inconsiderate opinion. A letter from the General to D'Azara affords a lively picture of the excited conversation, and shows how deeply the successor of St Dominic was hurt, as a theologian, a Dominican, and a Spaniard, by the abuse of the wrathful Pope.¹

The negotiations at Florence led to no result. Mgr. Galeppi repudiated all idea of retractation, and, when the discussions were broken off, Pius VI. appealed to the King of Spain and the other Catholic powers. Then a new French diplomatist, Cacault, came to Rome in the place of Miot, to look after the interests of France in the execution of the provisions of the truce. Shortly after appeared an envoy from Naples, desirous of concluding a defensive alliance with the Pope. It was General Acton, the Machiavellian Minister of King Ferdinand, who made this proposal; but the spies of Bonaparte in Naples had already long ago reported what was going on to the French headquarters, and Bonaparte immediately made Cacault write to Acton and say that a French army would appear on the frontier, if he ventured to allow Neapolitan soldiers to enter the Papal States.

To bring the matter to an issue, Bonaparte sent a letter to Cardinal Mattei, in which he suggested that Mattei should go to Rome and enlighten Pius VI. as to the real state of affairs, and with regard to the dangers which might result from

¹ Séché I, 64. The letter is dated 17th September 1796.

protracted obstinacy on the part of the Papacy.¹ Mattei went; but he found the Pope fully determined to try the fortunes of war. Cardinal Albani was sent to Vienna to beg help of Austria, and it was hoped in Rome that the victories of France would soon be succeeded by defeat. On the feast of the Epiphany 1797 the new banners of the Papal army bearing the well-known inscription, *In hoc signo vinces*, were consecrated with great solemnity in St Peter's, and the prelate who said the Mass addressed to the troops on the occasion some words about the approach of a "Holy War."²

All the hopes of Rome were quickly shattered. As soon as Bonaparte learned that Pius VI. had made an alliance with Austria, he ordered Caccia to leave Rome within six hours, and then he turned his hand against the Papal States. After firing a few shots near Castel Bolognese, the Papal troops retired in great haste, whereupon the French occupied Ancona without striking a blow, and pushed on as far as Tolentino (13th February). The tidings of the fall of Ancona caused the greatest consternation at Rome. Pius VI. immediately summoned a congregation of cardinals, which resolved that the successor of St Peter should flee to the Neapolitan frontier with his ministers, while the cardinal-bishops should betake themselves to their sees. The costly tiaras of the Pope and all his precious stones were packed up, all the cash that could be got out of the banks and lending houses was gathered together, and on Saturday, 11th February, at eventide, the flight was to be accomplished. But when it was noised abroad in Rome that Pius VI. was intending to leave, a great multitude thronged the piazza of St Peter's, and when the Pope was about to mount into his carriage, the advocate Bartolucci gathered up courage and made such strong remonstrances that the Pope's flight was for the moment given up. Instead of doing as he had intended, Pius VI. sent Cardinal Mattei, his nephew Braschi, the Marchese Massimi, and Mgr. Galeppi to Tolentino to sue for peace.³

Bonaparte had shown great humanity and moderation in the occupied districts. He kept firm discipline amongst his

¹ Séché I, 80f.

² D'Azara's despatch of 13th January 1797. Séché I, 249f.

³ D'Azara's despatch of 18th February 1797. Séché I, 276f.

troops, and did not allow religion to be outraged. But the conditions of peace which he now imposed were naturally more rigorous than those at Bologna. By the peace of Tolentino, concluded on 19th February, the Pope was obliged to abandon his claims upon Avignon and Venaissin, Bologna, Ferrara, and Romagna; he was compelled to promise to disband his army, to deliver up the manuscripts and art treasures which were formerly promised, and to pay 15,000,000 *livre* more than were imposed upon him at Bologna.¹ Five days later Pius VI. signed the hard and humiliating treaty of peace, and he might even count himself happy that Bonaparte, as his aide-de-camp, Marmont, says, still allowed himself to be so much guided by political calculations and practical considerations that he was insensible to the honour of entering the metropolis of the Christian world as a conqueror.²

So far from doing this, Bonaparte sent Marmont to Rome to arrange the necessary details for the execution of the terms of peace. Pius VI. received the young officer "with dignity and kindness," and Marmont found the venerable old man, who spoke with interest of Bonaparte, and with admiration of the French victories, both impressive and charming; but he was shocked at the levity of the Romans. In the fortnight he spent in the town he saw all the inhabitants devoting themselves to enjoyment, and the light-mindedness of the women, according to his accounts, surpassed all description.³ And yet this peace of Tolentino was in reality the beginning of the end of the temporal power of the Pope. When Bonaparte forwarded the terms of peace to the Directory, he accompanied them with a letter showing the importance which he himself attached to what France gained at Tolentino.⁴ It was better, he said, to get the three best provinces of the Papal States surrendered by the Pope of his own free will than to have taken it all by force; and the 30,000,000 *livre* promised to France were in his estimation worth ten

¹ The conditions are found in *Correspondance de Napoléon I.* II, 444f.

² *Mémoires du duc de Raguse* (Paris 1857) I, 262.

³ "Je trouvai la société extrêmement animée et livrée exclusivement aux plaisirs; la facilité des femmes romaines, alors autorisée par les maris, passe toute croyance; un mari parlait des amants de sa femme sans embarras et sans mécontentement." *Mémoires du duc de Raguse* I, 264f.

⁴ *Correspondance de Napoléon I.* II, 442.

times as much to the French as Rome itself. "It is my opinion," he writes, "that when Rome has lost Bologna, Ferrara, and Romagna, and the thirty millions that we have taken, it cannot hold together any longer; the old machine will fall to pieces of itself." D'Azara passed the same judgment on the situation. It seemed to him that Rome could not possibly fulfil the heavy economic obligations. "The Pope," he writes, "will by the cession of all his best provinces become powerless and without authority; and as the party in Rome, which is desirous of a change of government, has grown enormously, it will be a miracle if a revolution does not take place in Rome with incalculable consequences."¹

Even among the cardinals there were some who, like Cardinal Doria,² clearly perceived the difficulties of the position; and they insisted that Rome should in every particular fulfil her obligations, and renounce all thoughts of revenge in order to escape still greater calamities. But most of the members of the Sacred College, of which an overwhelming majority had voted for the fatal breach of the truce,³ consoled themselves with the silent hope that the fortunes of war would soon turn, and that Austria or Naples would send help. Amongst the adherents of the *Zelanti* hatred of France and the French increased in proportion as the revolutionary party, not without incitement from Paris, more and more daringly lifted up its head in Rome. On the 21st of October the zealous Lareveillère-Lépeaux wrote to Bonaparte, in view of the death of the Pope, which was then considered imminent: "We must use the opportunity to favour the institution of a representative government in Rome, and to deliver the world at last from the dominion of the Pope."⁴ There were many other Frenchmen besides the apostle of Theophilanthropism who hoped for the approaching fall of the Papacy.

The republicans in Rome, however, had not patience enough to wait for the Pope's death. In the night between 27th and 28th December some of them, starting at the Villa Medici on

¹ Despatch of 24th February 1797. Séché I, 288.

² Brosch II, 209f.

³ According to a communication of Pius VI. to the Duke Braschi two-thirds of the cardinals had voted for the war; see D'Azara's despatch of 8th February 1797. Séché I, 273.

⁴ L. von Ranke: *Hist.-biogr. Studien* (Leipzig 1877), 4.

the Pincian Hill, attempted to plant trees of liberty in several places of the town.¹ The military guards easily quelled the disturbances that night; but the next evening the Roman republicans assembled in front of the Palazzo Corsini in the Via della Longara in Trastevere, where the envoy of France, Joseph Bonaparte, was living, and an eventful encounter took place, of which the most trustworthy account is given in a despatch from Joseph Bonaparte to Talleyrand.² According to that account, a few of the Roman revolutionaries had already visited Joseph Bonaparte on 27th December, to tell him that on the following night a revolution would break out in the town. Joseph answered that in consequence of his position at the Papal Court, he could not become a party to such a plot; and he represented to them that the intended revolution would be both unprofitable and untimely. No regard was paid to these remonstrances. At four o'clock he was roused by a great noise, but, as has been said already, the tumult was soon quelled, and Joseph slept peacefully that night.

The day following, when he had heard more of the events of the night, he went to the Papal Secretary of State and begged him to punish all those Romans, who, not being in the service of the Legation, had assumed the French cockade. While he was sitting at dinner on the evening of the same day in the Palazzo Corsini, the porter brought word that a score of people assembled outside were distributing French cockades and shouting: "Long live the Republic! Long live the Roman people!" One of them, an artist, whom Joseph Bonaparte knew, wished to speak to the Ambassador of France. He began by saying: "We are free, and we have come to ask the support of France." Joseph advised the excited young man to keep quiet, and to exhort his companions to be still, informing him that he would not afford the Roman revolutionaries any protection whatsoever. After the artist had departed, it was

¹ *Mémoires de Pie VI.* II, 321f. Thugut's and Cobenzl's despatches in Sybel V, 1f.

² *Mémoires et Correspondance du roi Joseph*, par A. du Casse (second edition, Paris 1853) I, p. 174f. In harmony with this is a despatch of D'Azara of 29th December 1797 in Séché I, 169f. and 330f. From the papal side we have a report from the commandant of the barracks at Ponte Sisto, printed in Artaud: *Histoire du pape Pie VII.* I, p. 45f., and the account of Consalvi in his *Mémoires* (second edition, Paris 1866) II, p. 57f.

announced that the Via della Longara was quite full of people, shouting: "Long live the Republic!" When Joseph heard it, he called for the insignia of his ambassadorial rank, and descended the stairs to reason with the crowd; but before he got out of the palace he heard an outcry, and the court of the palace was full of people, who had taken refuge there, pursued by Papal troops. Joseph asked the leader of the troops by what right Papal soldiers had entered the premises that were under the jurisdiction of France, and ordered them to retire. General Duphot, who had followed Joseph Bonaparte, eager as he was, sprang in amongst the troops, and followed the crowd down the Via della Longara as far as the Porta Settimiana. There he dropped down, struck by two bullets, and no sooner was he fallen to the ground than many shots were fired upon the inanimate corpse, and the clothes were torn off it.¹

The death of Duphot exasperated the Romans of the French party beyond measure, and Joseph Bonaparte quitted Rome immediately. The brave young general was next day to have married Joseph's sister-in-law, the child sweetheart of General Bonaparte, Désirée-Eugénie Clary, of Marseilles, who later on became the wife of Bernadotte.² For this reason the death of Duphot was in more than one way a source of grief to the General of the Italian army, and the Directory was infuriated when it received intelligence of what had happened. The *Moniteur* called upon the French nation to shed tears "because one of its most distinguished generals had fallen at the hands of the priestly assassins at Rome," and General Berthier was immediately ordered to march upon that city with 15,000 soldiers. When the French were two days' journey from the town, it was intended that Pius VI. should be forced by menaces to flee, so as to avoid laying hands on the successor of St Peter.³

As soon as the French drew near to Rome, the terrified Pope sent out agents with a view to stopping the French army, but they were turned away. Not until the gates of Rome were reached, would Berthier consent to give them an

¹ D'Azara's despatch, Séché I, p. 170.

² *Mémoires du roi Joseph I*, p. 181. F. Masson: *Napoléon et les femmes* (Paris 1894), p. 18.

³ The date of the Order is 14th January 1798; it is given in *Correspondance de Napoléon I*. III, p. 475.

interview. On 10th February, he had advanced to that point, and as Pius had not fled, as was expected of him, Berthier made a series of humiliating demands upon him. He asked for the right to place a garrison in the Castle of Sant' Angelo, a fresh contribution of money and horses, and the erection of two monuments to Bassville and to Duphot. Pius VI. conceded everything. For some days, it seemed as if the French were going to maintain the Pope's authority in the town, and Berthier was content to establish his headquarters outside the Porta del Popolo, between Monte Mario and Pontemolle. But on 15th February about three hundred Roman "patriots" assembled in the Forum Romanum to proclaim the abolition of the Papal government and the reign of liberty and equality. A tree of liberty was planted on the Capitol, and seven consuls were elected who showed their mind forthwith by inviting the French general to a meeting in the citadel. Berthier accepted the invitation, and, on that spot so full of memories, he begged the spirits of Cato, of Pompey, of Brutus, of Cicero, and of Hortensius to accept the homage of the freemen of France. A few days later, a deputation consisting of Jews, apostate monks, and rebels, waited upon Pius VI. in order to extract from him a recognition of the Roman republic. Pius answered that God had bestowed the sovereignty upon him, and that he could not abdicate it; he said that he was an old man of more than eighty years of age, who was ready to bear any outrages that they might think fit to inflict upon him. Upon this reply, the Vatican was occupied by "patriots," who ordered Pius VI. to leave Rome within eight and forty hours.

On 20th February 1798, the aged Pope quitted his capital under military surveillance, accompanied only by a small band of attendants. A few days later, the cardinals also were ejected, although, as Alfieri told them with scathing contempt in his *Misogallo*, several of them had "sung the *Te Deum*, which was offered in St Peter's to celebrate the deposition of the Pope."¹ On the Tuscan frontier, the Pope was received as the guest of the Grand Duke,² and in that capacity took up his abode first at Siena, in the monastery

¹ Quoted by Brosch II, p. 214.

² A. von Reumont: *Geschichte Toscana's* II, 280f.

of the Augustinians, now the Collegio Tolomei, in the Piazza S. Agostino. When an earthquake compelled him to leave Siena (on 1st June 1798), he took his journey to the beautiful Certosa, situated about four miles out of Florence, with its glorious view over the valley of the Ema, and the snow-covered peaks of the chain of the Apennines. But by 12th March 1799 the Directory declared war against Tuscany, and on 27th March, the same day that the Grand Duke forsook Florence, the Pope, in spite of his fourscore and two years and his infirmity, had to leave the Certosa in the Val d'Ema,¹ to be conveyed by way of Parma, Tortona, and Turin, to the citadel of Valence in Dauphiné, where death on 29th August put an end to his anxieties and sufferings. His body remained unburied for four months, until Bonaparte, as one of the first proofs of the conciliatory mind of the Consulate towards the Church of Rome, granted the exiled Pope a grave, and erected a monument in his honour. The heart of Pius VI. is still preserved at Valence, but his dust rests in the crypt under St Peter's;² and in the confession near the high altar of St Peter's, close by the grave of the Apostle, surrounded by the ever-burning lamps, is seen his kneeling figure, chiselled by the hand of Canova.

The prophecy of Malachias was well adapted to Pius VI., when it foretold that a *peregrinus apostolicus* would be the successor of Clement XIV. But the description is still better suited to the Pope who came next; for the affliction and exile of Pius VI. were only a prelude to the still greater affliction, and the still more bitter exile, that awaited his successor.

¹ Reumont II, p. 289.

² The removal of the body to Rome took place in 1802. Artaud : *Histoire du Pape Pie VII.* I, p. 237f.

CHAPTER VIII

PIUS VII.—THE CONCLAVE IN VENICE

PIUS VI. had decreed the year before he died that, in view of the special circumstances, the Conclave which was to choose his successor should meet where most of the cardinals were living, or where the Dean of the College of Cardinals, Giovanni Francesco Albani, thought it most suitable.¹ When Pius VI. left Rome, Cardinal Albani fled to Naples, where he assembled ten other cardinals, in conjunction with whom he sent a missive to the Roman Catholic sovereigns, through the nuncios, to complain of the treatment of the Pope, and to protest against the occupation of the patrimony of St Peter. This document caused the Austrian government much displeasure, partly because it was promulgated from Naples. It was feared in Vienna that it contained an indication that the next Conclave would be held at Naples, and not on imperial ground, as people in Austria wished. Cardinal Albani, however, hastened to inform the Court of Vienna that nobody thought of holding the Conclave there; and when the King of the Two Sicilies left his capital on 31st December 1798, and retired to Sicily, most of the cardinals who were assembled at Naples set sail for Venice. As soon as the news of the death of Pius VI. reached that place, at the end of September, 1799, the Cardinal-Dean invited the members of the college to the city of the lagoons in order to take counsel where the Conclave should meet. Cardinal Albani had at the beginning hopes of being able to summon the cardinals to Rome, because, while Bonaparte was in Egypt, the Russians and Austrians had expelled the

¹ The Bull: *Quum nos superiore anno* (13th November 1798), issued from the Certosa in Val d'Ema. *Bullarium Romanum* X, 175f.

French from Italy. But the Austrian ambassador, Baron Thugut, seems to have opposed this project,¹ and, after some discussion, Venice was chosen as the place for the Conclave.

Before the Conclave opened, it was necessary to appoint a secretary for it. The secretary of the College of Cardinals, Cardinal Negroni, was the obvious person for this post; but he was out of favour with the other cardinals, and he was then residing at Rome. They determined, therefore, to pass him by and to choose another for this important position. Many prelates of high standing coveted the favour of the cardinals; but their votes gathered round one who, according to his own account, did not at all desire the post of honour, and Ercole Consalvi, one of the twelve members of the Court of Appeal of the Roman Church (*rota Romana*), was chosen secretary of the Conclave.

This remarkable man,² who played a leading part in the history of the Papacy during the first part of the nineteenth century, was born at Rome on 8th June 1757. His grandfather, Gregorio Brunacci, a nobleman of Pisan extraction, in order to become heir to a certain Marquis Consalvi, belonging to one of the richest families of Toscanella, changed his ancient and noble name of Brunacci for the less high-born, but not less honourable one of Consalvi. The grandchild of Gregorio Consalvi, Ercole, was the eldest of five children, who were early left orphans. Ercole and his younger brother were first educated by the Piarists at Urbino, a branch of the order of schoolmasters which Jose Calasanzio

¹ Rossi de Bisamberg's despatch of 30th October 1799 in Petruccelli della Gattina IV, 285.

² For what follows cp. Bartholdy: *Züge aus dem Leben des Cardinals H. Consalvi* (Stuttgart 1825). Wiseman: *Recollections of the last four Popes* (London 1858). L. von Ranke: *Hist.-biogr. Studien* (Leipzig 1877), 11f., and *Mémoires du Cardinal Consalvi*, par Crétineau-Joly (second edition, Paris 1866), 1-11. It is established (Maynard: *Crétineau-Joly*, 448) that the editor (about whom see above, p. 61) on at least one not unimportant occasion has allowed himself to "improve" the *Mémoires* by inserting what Consalvi, according to his opinion, ought to have written (*avec son caractère a dû répondre*). In the presence of such untrustworthiness it is a duty to use great caution. It will also, on several points, be necessary to follow the despatches published by A. Theiner (*Histoire des deux concordats*, Paris 1869 I), where the accounts of the *Mémoires* deviate from them. Yet on several occasions it is possible, even probable, that the discrepancies are due to slips of memory on the part of Consalvi, and not to falsifications of the editor; cp. Ranke, 21 note, and A. von Druffel in the *Historische Zeitschrift*, 1884, 64f.

of Aragon had founded in 1617. But the brothers remained there only four years. One of the Piarists used regularly every evening to chastise the children on the naked body as a punishment for the faults of the day, and in the course of such a punishment Ercole's brother sustained a serious damage to the knee. For this reason both the brothers were taken away from the school at Urbino, and were admitted into the college which Cardinal Henry of York at that time opened at Frascati, close to the ancient Tusculum.¹ The Cardinal of York, or, as he preferred to be styled, the Cardinal-Duke, was a grandchild of King James II., and a younger brother of the Stuart Pretender, Charles Edward, who also lived in Italy under the title of the Earl of Albany. After the death of Charles Edward the Cardinal of York called himself Henry IX., King of France and England, and subscribed to his last will the signature of *Henry Roy*. But this designation was rather an expression of his legitimist views than a claim to the English crown. Cardinal Henry was a well meaning man, but a hypochondriac. The only work which he left was a sort of medical autobiography privately printed for friends, which contains an elaborate account of all his illnesses, and of the doctors whose advice he had sought. He had no great intellectual gifts, and no particular learning, but he took pleasure in diffusing information and in advancing knowledge. The school at Frascati was kept in excellent condition, and it acquired a very large library, especially rich in English books. The young people were taught by able masters, and the Cardinal-Duke was intimate with both masters and pupils. He was a great lover of music, and it was at a musical entertainment that he is said to have first noticed the young Ercole Consalvi.

Ercole soon became one of his favourite *protégés*. The old descendant of kings was pleased to find in the gifted young man a strongly developed self-reliance and a firm belief in a glorious future. Consalvi also tried his hand at poetry. Italy, at the time, had poets by the hundred, and all learned men wrote sonnets and *canzonette*. Most of this so-called poetry was only rhythmical prose, and Consalvi's own contribution to poetical

¹ A. von Reumont : *Aus den Papieren des Cardinals von York*, in the *Historisches Jahrbuch* I, 23f.

literature does not seem to deserve any other name. He sang in a Latin epigram about Samson and Delilah, and in Italian Anacreontic verse about a tame canary; but he composed also an Italian poem which was recited at one of the annual examinations at Frascati, and this poem betrays the bright hope for the future which the young Abate entertained. It is written in the pastoral style of the time; for the poet of fifteen was a member of the great poetical society of the Jesuits at Rome, called *Arcadia*, which in spite of its classical Greek dress had chosen *Gesù Bambino* as its protector.¹ Consalvi addresses Pallas Athene, and implores of her strength for the hard work and the late hours which studies necessitate; but as a reward he expects "renown, honour and riches—a spur to noble deeds."²

When the young Consalvi had finished his course at the school and in the seminary at Frascati, he entered, in 1776, the ecclesiastical Academy in Rome, where amongst others he had the former Jesuit Zaccaria for his master. The pupils of this academy were the special favourites of Pius VI., and Consalvi had scarcely finished his education, when the Pope in 1783 entrusted him with the office of *cameriere segreto*. In this capacity it was his duty to receive those who desired audiences at the Vatican. Next year he was appointed one of the Pope's domestic prelates; then a member of the Congregation *del buon governo*, and at the same time, for a while, under the protection of his uncle, Cardinal Negroni, secretary to the great benevolent institution of San Michele a Ripa. The institution before long underwent a change, and Consalvi in consequence lost this post, because the Pope considered that his great gifts could be better employed at the Bar than in administration. When a member of the pontifical *segnatura* died, Consalvi obtained the vacant place, under circumstances which assured him that he was in special favour. His predecessor died on the Thursday in Holy Week, and on Good Friday Consalvi was appointed *votante di segnatura*. He hastened immediately to the Pope to render him thanks. Although Pius VI. as a rule never received grateful officials, and in spite of the holy day, Consalvi was immediately admitted and received by the Pope with the

¹ Settembrini III, 102f.

² The poem is given in its complete form in Wiseman, 105f; a fragment in Bartholdy, 5f.

promise of more conspicuous promotion at the first opportunity. When the post of nuncio at Cologne¹ became vacant, Pius VI. offered his favourite this important appointment, but he refused, and Pacca was sent instead.

Consalvi remained in Rome, secretly wishing to become eventually a member of the Roman *rota*, which in Roman Catholic countries is honoured with the name of "the asylum of justice." The members of the *rota Romana* had long holidays, and in these Consalvi wished to be able to gratify his love of travelling. Hitherto he had only seen Tuscany and Naples, but he longed to go further afield. When a place on the *rota* as *uditore* for Rome fell vacant, he obtained it on the strength of the favour in which he stood with the Pope, and because of his powerful connexions.

Frascati was then the place where the rich Roman nobility spent the autumn months, and Consalvi often stayed there. Being a close friend of the Cardinal-Duke and a gifted man of society, he became a welcome guest in noble houses both at Frascati and in Rome, so that he came to be called in jest *Monsignore Ubique*. Amidst his daily duties in Rome and the feasts of Frascati he did not forget his studies; but he endeavoured beyond all else to acquire a close knowledge of human nature by intercourse with mankind. Music was his only passion. When Cimarosa, the composer of *Il Matrimonio Segreto*, Rossini's rival, came to Rome to get his operas put on the stage, Consalvi could spend whole nights with him in order to be the first to hear his works. But he would never listen to Rossini's music.

The reorganisation of the papal army had for a long time been a necessity, and it was effected by means of Consalvi. The post of Papal Minister of War was abolished, because the Austrian General, Caprara, who was to superintend the reorganisation, refused to be under the control of a War Minister who was bound to be a prelate. As the Pope on the other hand could not forgo the supervision of his own army, a military Congregation was formed, consisting of the Commander-in-Chief, some officers of high rank, and a prelate with the title of Assessor, who on behalf of the Pope and the Secretary of State was to follow the development of the defences of the country.

¹ See above, p. 132.

This important post was given to Consalvi. Very different judgments were passed upon this new military organisation, and the carrying of it into effect met with much difficulty. Consalvi, meanwhile, was of opinion that it was done at the right moment, because thereby the Directory "lost the satisfaction of seeing the Pope's throne overturned by a home rebellion."¹ The Directory was obliged to "throw off the mask" and remove Pius VI., and for this act of violence the fate of General Duphot afforded, as we have seen, a welcome opportunity.

As soon as the Pope was carried off, Consalvi was seized and thrown into the Castle of Sant' Angelo. There he remained three or four months, either because he was altogether forgotten, or because the French governors were so often changed, that they never found time to examine matters thoroughly. After the expiration of this period he was suddenly removed from the castle to a monastery, and it was rumoured that he and certain cardinals and prelates were to be sent into exile at Cayenne. This punishment was exchanged for deportation to a place chosen by themselves, and Consalvi and his fellow prisoners were brought to Cività Vecchia, thence to be carried further off. It was Consalvi's wish to go to Livorno, from whence he could easily visit Pius VI. in the Certosa in the Val d'Ema. His many friends at Rome, having heard that the prisoners were to be sent to Cayenne, did all they could to obtain permission for his return to Rome; but by this they did him an awkward service. When he arrived in Rome, the Revolution had gained a complete victory, and one or two of the consuls in the new Republic were not at all friendly disposed towards him. Accordingly, he was again taken to the Castle of Sant' Angelo, and his friends informed him, that they had obtained leave for him to travel to Naples, but not to the Pope. To this leave, however, was attached the condition, that he should first ride through the streets on an ass, while the *Sbirri* whipped him with leathern thongs. Window seats were already hired in the thoroughfares through which the procession was to pass; but the French general was opposed to such a spectacle.² Together

¹ Consalvi II, 49f.

² When the papal rule had been re-established, the last two Roman consuls were taken through the streets in a similar procession. D'Haussonville: *L'église romaine et le premier empire* (second edition, Paris 1869) I, 51.

"with eighteen galley slaves and four respectable people" Consalvi was sent to Naples. When he came to the frontier, he was not allowed to cross it, until the Cardinal-Duke, who had fled to Naples, interceded for him with the Neapolitan Minister, Acton, "who felt himself flattered at being able to do something for a legitimate prince." At Naples Consalvi found several friends, but he would not settle down there. He longed to get to Florence and to see the Pope. On his allegation that his aged uncle on the mother's side, Cardinal Carandini, who lived at Venice, desired to see him, he obtained a passport to that town. He travelled by way of Livorno and the Val d'Ema, and there he met Pius VI. Before leaving the Val d'Ema, he received the blessing of the dying Pope, and he promised Pius VI. to do all that lay in his power for the Braschi family.

When Consalvi reached Venice towards the end of September, he received the news that his goods had been confiscated. In the first instance, they had been appropriated to the Republic on the ground that their owner had emigrated, but when Consalvi's friends pointed out that this was not the case, the consuls issued two new decrees. By one of these they restored his property to Citizen Consalvi, because he had not emigrated, but, by the second, they confiscated them afresh, because he was an enemy of the Roman Republic. Such was republican logic.

As soon as Consalvi became secretary of the Conclave, his first duty was to communicate to the various Courts the news of the Pope's death. Under normal conditions this would not be a very formidable task; all that was required was to put together a few sentences in praise of the deceased Pope, and the same letter might be sent to all. But under the circumstances it was a difficult task, and one which demanded a different treatment in each case. Austria had occupied the three Legations and the Papal States right up to the gates of Rome. Naples had taken Rome and the Papal territory as far as Terracina, and the Spanish King had indulged in several acts, which, from the papal point of view, could only be regarded as intolerable encroachments. Furthermore, the Conclave was to be held on foreign ground, in a town belonging to the power which had usurped the possession of

several of the Papal provinces. Consalvi did not take in hand the difficult task without anxiety. First of all he sent a letter to the Head of the Holy Roman Empire, in which he spoke of him as a combination of Constantine, Theodosius, and Charles the Great. He reminded him in the letter of the close connexion between the throne and the altar, saying: "The enemies of the Church are your enemies. Too many crowned heads, alas, in our time have seen that the princely power falls when the dignity of the Church decays. Restore the Church of God to her ancient splendour; then the enemies of the Crown will shake in terror of the mighty sword, which guards the holy empire!"¹ To Paul I., Emperor of Russia, a member of the Greek Orthodox Communion, who had ordered his soldiers to protect the Roman Church, was addressed a missive which breathes a special good-will. The late Pope had always thought of Paul I.—so it tells him—with the liveliest interest, since the day when he held him in his arms. And who of all the princes could better avert the perils which threatened the Church? Who could win renown in a happier way?² Even to "the King of France," the exiled Louis XVIII., who had only been "the Count of Provence" to Pius VI., the College of Cardinals sent their message and their greeting at the instigation of Cardinal Maury. It was, so runs the communication to him, the same ungodly hands that were sullied with the blood of his royal brother, which, in his kingdom of France, had brought about the death of the saintly Pope. The day which saw Louis XVIII. again seated on the throne of his forefathers would be a happy day for the Church, as well as for him, for then the Most Christian King would restore the Church to its ancient splendour, make religion, piety, and good morals flourish afresh in the kingdom, and form a good and docile people.³

After the composition of these letters it was the secretary's duty to provide room for the Conclave. When it was held at Rome, the Vatican was its regular meeting-place; on a few occasions, especially when sanitary reasons required it, the cardinals had assembled at the Quirinal.⁴ This time the

¹ Consalvi I, 221f.

² *Ibid.*, 225f.

³ *Ibid.*, 228f.

⁴ Lucius Lector: *Le conclave*, 312f.

first place which occurred to the cardinals was the roomy Benedictine monastery of S. Giustina at Padua which stood on imperial soil. At one moment they talked of Parma, which seemed to offer many advantages, and, finally, the suggestion was made of either Perugia or Viterbo, where conclaves had been held before, and where the French yoke had then been thrown off. They wished to be upon ground which was both free and historic; but at last it was decided—chiefly, as it seems, for economical reasons—to accept the Emperor's offer of the Benedictine monastery of San Giorgio Maggiore on the lagoon, of which the cupola and high campanile rise immediately opposite the piazza of San Marco and the Riva degli Schiavoni. The months of October and November passed by while the preparations for the Conclave were making, and as both the College of Cardinals and the Papal See were totally destitute of funds, it was necessary for the Austrian government to defray most of the expenses. A few wealthy cardinals, like the Archbishop of Toledo, whose annual income was more than 1,500,000 francs, contributed their share to the many and heavy expenses which the Conclave involved;¹ but most of the cardinals lived in such a depressed condition that they needed support. Some were even reduced to accepting pensions from Protestant governments. Thus Denmark paid a yearly sum of a thousand *lire* to Cardinal Borgia, who took a paternal interest in all Danish travellers to Rome, while England bestowed £4000 a year upon the Cardinal of York, that he might be able to live 'as beseemed his royal birth.'² Several of the cardinals who lived away from Venice found it difficult to raise the sum necessary for the journey to the lagoons. The rich Roman banker, Marchese Torlonia, who had helped the Papacy in the payments connected with the peace of Tolentino, again placed his credit and his resources at the disposal of the cardinals; but they took no advantage of his offer any more than of those from the republican capitalists of Rome.³

In the end of November the usual nine days' Masses (*novendiali*) were celebrated for the deceased Pope, and on 30th November, the first Sunday in Advent, thirty-four out of

¹ *Mémoires du Cardinal Maury* I, 214f.

² *Ibid.*, 360.

³ Consalvi I, 234f.; Maury I, 249.

the forty-six cardinals whom the Roman Church then had,¹ went into conclave. The cardinals assembled with a lively consciousness that great events were impending. On the very same day, 8th October, when Consalvi sent out the despatches to the crowned heads, Bonaparte returned from Egypt; and before the doors were shut upon the cardinals in the monastery of San Giorgio, the 18th of Brumaire compelled the Directory to make way for the Consulate.

Some important changes in the old rules for the Conclave were of necessity made on this occasion, because Rome was not the place of assembly; but in the main those rules were observed.² Some time elapsed, however, before anything was done; the Emperor had been invited to send an ambassador to the Conclave, but the Court of Vienna replied that its interests should be watched over by Cardinal Hrzan, who was on the way to Venice. They were obliged, accordingly, to wait for him.

As soon as Hrzan arrived, the voting began. Three groups formed themselves amongst the cardinals. The Austrian party ostensibly led by Antonelli, secretly by Hrzan, wished to have the Cardinal-Archbishop of Ferrara, Alessandro Mattei,³ for pope, because he had taken part in the conclusion of peace at Tolentino. The Austrian government was anxious to retain the Legations which had been ceded by that peace to France, and they therefore desired a pope who might conceivably be willing to acquiesce in such a cession. Some even thought that Austria had already secured the consent of Mattei on this point. But the Austrian party among the cardinals did not immediately propose Mattei. When Hrzan arrived in the Conclave, he only declared that the Emperor wished for a pope who suited him. It was not necessary, he said, to choose a talented man, for in Rome a pope could easily obtain the necessary "lights." But it was important to choose a good man, who was in favour at Vienna.⁴

¹ Their names are given in Séché: *Les origines du Concordat* II, 2.

² Consalvi I, 233f.; Maury I, 264f.; Petruccelli della Gattina IV, 291f.; Séché II, 1f., and Cipolletta: *Memorie politiche sui Conclavi da Pio VII. a Pio IX.* (Milan 1863), 6of.

³ Concerning him see Maury I, 212.

⁴ Maury I, 273. Letter to Louis XVIII. of 14th December 1799.

The next main group was, in the strict sense of the word, the Roman party. Its official leader was the nephew of the late Pope, Cardinal Braschi,¹ who gathered round him all the princes of the Church who were under obligations to Pius VI. The real leader of the party was Albani, its candidate Bellisomi,² then Bishop of Cesena, formerly nuncio in Poland and in Portugal. He was a man who would unconditionally maintain the rights of the Papal States. Bellisomi had several very faithful followers, amongst others Cardinal Calcagnini, who at a later moment was not far from being chosen Pope by this Conclave. When Hrzan, in the beginning of January, applied to Calcagnini in order to induce him to vote for Mattei, the bold Cardinal answered: "I have been twenty days at Ferrara thinking over the election of a Pope, twenty more at Padua, and twenty more again here at Venice, and my conscience has never been satisfied with anyone but Bellisomi. It is of no avail to speak to me in this matter; I am unchangeable. Good-bye."³

Besides these two groups, each of which had a definite candidate, there was a third party consisting of the unattached (*volanti*). To this belonged, amongst others, the Cardinal-Duke of York, the learned Cardinals Borgia and Gerdil, and the French Cardinal, Maury, Bishop of Montefiascone, whose recently published letters to Louis XVIII.⁴ are an important source of information for the back-stairs history of the Conclave. There are not many members of the Conclave who escape the pointed criticisms passed by the old rival of Mirabeau in his letters to his prince; all the Italians especially are taken severely to task—those unprincipled, untrustworthy beings who have no conception of a great character, and who always understand how to turn round at the right moment, inasmuch as according to their morality it is the greatest folly to be in a minority.⁵ Maury is often so unmerciful in his criticism of his colleagues, that he is obliged to remind Louis XVIII. of the words of Fénelon: "God does His work in the Conclaves amidst the clash of passions, and it is always His will that prevails."⁶

¹ Maury I, 211.

² *Ibid.*, 278.

³ *Ibid.*, 364.

⁴ They are to be found in the often quoted *Correspondance et Mémoires du Cardinal Maury*, par Ricard (Lille 1891), 1-11.

⁵ Maury I, 454.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 360.

Besides Austria, Naples was the only other power which followed the transactions of the Conclave with special interest. It can be gathered from various despatches¹ and from the instructions given to Cardinal Ruffo² that the plan of the Neapolitans was to strain every nerve to secure Benevento and Pontecorvo for themselves, and to give to Catholic Christendom a pope who would demand the restitution of his ancient states and would drive Austria back to the other side of the River Po. Ruffo made his *début* in the Conclave by saying that his government would never acquiesce in the choice of a subject of the Emperor.³ The French to begin with were fully occupied with other things; and besides, the election of a pope meant very little to France, as France was at the beginning of the new century. Not that that country was quite without friends in the Conclave. Chiaramonti, Di Pietro, and Doria, formerly nuncio at Paris, had in spite of everything great sympathy with the eldest daughter of Rome; but it was dangerous for members of a Conclave held on Austrian soil to acknowledge this sympathy. Spain, which in former times, as we have seen, had taken keen interest in the politics of conclaves, was now wholly indifferent. In 1797, when the death of Pius VI. was expected, Carlos IV. had expressed his wish to see the Spanish Cardinal, Lorenzana, in the chair of St Peter, but D'Azara immediately informed him that for the last two centuries none but Italians had been elected.⁴ To the horror of the cardinals,⁵ upon the death of Pius VI. the Spanish king, acting on the advice of his Minister, the Jansenist d'Urquijo,⁶ had immediately liberated his bishops from the oppressive guardianship of the Roman Curia and his people from several heavy contributions to the See of St Peter. Accordingly the cardinals at Venice looked with anxiety towards the land which gave birth to Loyola.

At one of the first ballots Bellisomi obtained eighteen votes,⁷ and from private conversations it became clear that a

¹ Cipolletta, 49f.

² Petruccelli della Gattina IV, 287.

³ Maury I, 354.

⁴ D'Azara's despatch of 10th October 1797 in Séché I, 328.

⁵ Maury I, 236.

⁶ Séché II, 4; following Boulay de la Meurthe: *Documents sur les négociations du concordat* I, 256.

⁷ Maury I, 278.

still larger number were disposed to vote for him. It seemed therefore that the Conclave would end quickly; but this was against the interests of Austria. Accordingly, Hrzan began his intrigues. He represented to Albani, the Dean of the College of Cardinals, how all-important it was for all friends of the Papal States to have a pope who was a *persona grata* at Vienna; that Bellisomi was by no means such a person, while Mattei was eminently so. Albani answered that the imminent election of Bellisomi would be the result of the free vote of the cardinals, and that he was in no position to hinder it. If on the other hand Austria chose to use her right of veto, that would be another matter. Hrzan then declared that he had not actually received orders to veto Bellisomi's election, but that he wished to consult his Court on the subject. He begged therefore that the final voting might be postponed until he could receive an answer from Vienna. Albani was weak enough to consent to such a postponement, although it was unlawful and involved a violation of the freedom of the Conclave. When Hrzan promised to abstain from all intrigues in the meanwhile, Albani, in consideration of Austria's political supremacy at the time, accorded a postponement of the decision for eleven or twelve days.

Hrzan did not keep his promise. The courier was scarcely despatched before he began to set his party in motion to make Bellisomi's election impossible. "There was in the Conclave," says Consalvi,¹ "a very upright and deserving cardinal, respected by all, but not loved by any, because he was of a hard nature." Joined to his many good qualities, this prelate had the failing of wishing to make people believe that everything that happened was due to him. He was not in sufficient favour to form any hope of the tiara for himself, but at least he would "create" the pope, and he used the delay accorded to Hrzan to concoct intrigues. Consalvi does not give the name of the cardinal he thus describes; but from the notes left by Cardinal Doria's conclavist, we know that Antonelli is meant. He had espoused Mattei's candidature with the greatest zeal, and he argued that the friendship of Austria would be the best means of recovering the Legations. At the same time Hrzan reminded the cardinals that Charles the Great, in his time,

¹ *Mémoires* I, 247. Cp. Maury I, 287, 294.

carried without difficulty the election of Hadrian I., and Charles V. the election of Hadrian VI; a similar complaisance ought to be shown to the Emperor now. By this means, Austria, which at the moment was the dominant power in Italy, might perhaps be induced to be more accommodating in relation to the Papacy. By the united energy of Hrzan and of Antonelli, Mattei soon obtained ten, and even thirteen, votes. But the reckless agitation of Hrzan caused also many anxieties, and aroused strong opposition on the part of those who did not wish for a pope who was in the hand of Austria. When the bold Austrian tried his powers of persuasion upon Albani, the Cardinal-Dean declared that the sacred college was determined to have full liberty in giving the Church a head, and so long as the cardinals were occupied with the fulfilment of this great duty, they would confidently leave the interests of the Holy See to Providence. Albani became so excited in the course of this conversation with Hrzan that he had a fainting fit; but he had expressed the thoughts of many of the cardinals, and his answer to Hrzan went the round of the Conclave as a winged word.¹

The message, which came at last from Vienna, contained a strong recommendation of Mattei;² but, after what had happened, to elect him was an impossibility. An attempt was then made to gather the votes round one or two of the "un-attached" and Calcagnini;³ and the last-named cardinal obtained four and twenty votes. His election was thus assured; but when the cardinals prepared themselves to kiss his hand in homage, Hrzan on behalf of the Court of Vienna interposed the veto. There was again a deadlock. While these painful events were taking place in the Conclave, revolutionary disturbances occurred in Venice. It was necessary to fetch new troops to keep order, and guns were mounted by the church and monastery on San Giorgio, to protect the Conclave against emergencies.

To Maury more than anyone else belongs the honour of having discovered the solution which brought an end to the more and more unseemly proceedings of the Conclave. In 1798, Louis XVIII. had told this representative of his in

¹ Maury I, 294.

² *Ibid.*, 304.

³ See above, p. 201.

the College of Cardinals, that he desired above all things to see him in the chair of St Peter. "I wish," he wrote to Maury, "that the future Head of the Church may be a man of ripe years, though not an old man; a man who has already given evidence of courage and good principles, whose eloquence is known all over Europe, and whose health is such as to bear the strain which now more than ever before will be inseparable from the papal tiara. In this picture your name only is wanting; it is you whom I wish to see elevated to the papal throne, and this would be the greatest good fortune that could befall France and the Church."¹ It is hardly likely that there were many besides Louis XVIII. who dreamt of seeing the Cardinal of Montefiascone made Pope, and Maury's own ambition did not go further than to "create" the new Pope. He used often to drink chocolate with one of his nearest neighbours in the Conclave, Cardinal Ruffo of Naples, and with him he naturally discussed again and again the great question of finding a candidate who might command a sufficient number of votes. Although Maury was Ruffo's "friend,"² he did not omit to give his King a malicious little silhouette of this Italian among others. Both in the service of Pius VI. and in that of the King of Naples he had displayed considerable political and military skill. Maury does not deny that Ruffo was born with talent, but he says that his character is brutal, and that he can neither master nor conceal his thoughts. He has a happy memory, but not many ideas, and his reading is limited to a few books on political economy which he thinks that nobody but himself has read.³ There is, doubtless, much that is strikingly like in this portrait, but part of it describes Maury himself as much as Ruffo. They were two kindred souls, and both of them enjoyed but a small degree of esteem amongst the other cardinals. Maury had constantly the impression that he was not highly valued in the sacred college, and Ruffo told his sovereign that he never spoke to others except when actually necessary, because on account of his political past in Naples they considered him a Jacobin.⁴

It was a chance that brought Maury and Ruffo together;

¹ Maury I, 188.

² *Ibid.*, 293. Cp. 259.

³ *Ibid.*, 353.

⁴ Petruccelli della Gattina IV, 300f.

but they suited each other admirably, and when Mattei, Bellisomi, and others had proved impossible, the two "friends" cast their eyes upon a new candidate, who little by little won favourable opinions. Ruffo tells his King that he had now and then conversed with another of the "Jacobins" of the Conclave. In his walks in the monastery garden, he sometimes met a cardinal "who walked with a very quick step, and used to hum one of the well-known tunes of the day as he went along." At first Ruffo had saluted him, then in passing exchanged a word or two; and at last it had come to longer conversations between the two "Jacobins." These conversations had convinced Ruffo that Chiaramonti—that was the name of the cardinal—was the right man, both in view of the needs of the time and in view of the private wishes of Naples.

Maury also had arrived at the same result. Although it was chiefly due to his energy that the cardinals before the Conclave saluted the Count of Provence as King of France, he had nevertheless followed with the greatest interest the rising star of General Bonaparte; and he shared the Italian dread of being in the minority, even if the minority was gathered round a legitimate king. It is not easy to decide whether he divined beforehand what a masterful part Bonaparte was by and by to play in his country—the country which he never forgot—or whether he thought that the formidable general, like another Monk, might be able to bring about a restoration of the Bourbons.¹ In the letter which he despatched to Louis XVIII. after the news of the 18th of Brumaire, he concluded with the following ambiguous words: "So now we have in Paris a new revolution, which will bring the true counter-revolution to ripen. This military government, which has been so hideously unmasked, creates horror. It means the end of Bonaparte, unless it be for him only the first step on the true and genuine path of honour."² While many of the other cardinals looked upon Austria as the power which beyond all others ought to be propitiated by the new Papal election, Maury became more and more convinced, that the centre of gravity lay and would always lie in his native land, and that General Bonaparte in one

¹ Ségur II, 19.

² Maury I, 262. The letter is of date 30th November 1799.

way or another was the man of the future. It was therefore of the utmost importance to secure a pope who had shown himself able to understand the French, and who would not be frightened when the words liberty and equality were mentioned. Such a man was the Cardinal of Imola. And if Maury could carry his election through, he would not only confer a benefit on the Church and on his own country but also on himself; because he who creates the Pope, has a right to expect to have his activity appreciated. And Maury had many wishes, which he expressed freely and unblushingly. In the letter which he sent to King Louis XVIII. only a week after the end of the Conclave, he was already able to inform him that his nephew had obtained a canonry in St Peter's at Rome, and that he himself had prospects of the richly endowed Archbishopric of Fermo, which would bring in 70,000 *lire* a year, and that he hoped that in that case his brother would succeed to the bishopric of Montefiascone!¹ Many things serve to indicate that it was not entirely for the sake of France and of the Church, that Cardinal Maury decided to work for the election of Chiaramonti, coupled as it was with peculiar difficulties.

Barnaba Luigi Chiaramonti² was born on 14th August 1742 at Cesena in the Legation of Forlì. His father belonged to the Italian nobility, but not to the most distinguished nor to the richest section of it. He had studied at Parma, and at the age of sixteen he joined the Benedictine order, on which occasion he added the name of Gregory to his baptismal name. At a later time he came to Rome as a teacher of divinity, and there he defended in public certain theses, amongst others this, that there is a place in heaven for women, which a contemporary fanatic had denied. He was distantly related to Pius VI., and by his favour the young Chiaramonti was made titular abbot of the Benedictine monastery of San Callisto, so that he was allowed to wear the ring and mitre, and occupied a special seat in the choir of the monastery; but was otherwise under the abbot chosen by the monks themselves.

¹ Maury I, 376f.

² Cp. Artaud: *Histoire du pape Pie VII.* (Paris 1837), I-II, and Cardinal Wiseman's work above mentioned, in which everything is painted in rose-colour; together with Alessandro Gavazzi: *My Recollections of the last four Popes* (London 1858), which follows Wiseman, "as the shadow the body," with a criticism which is often very bitter.

This papal appointment caused jealousy in the monastery, and several complaints were raised against Abbot Gregory. During the examination of these complaints, Pius VI. made closer acquaintance with his kinsman, and came to be very fond of him. When the bishopric of the beautiful Tivoli became vacant, Chiaramonti was appointed to it, but he continued to be a monk in mind and thought. In the wood by Tivoli he allowed several hermits to build their huts—amongst others the Redemptorist, Clement Hoffbauer of Vienna.¹

When the Pope's uncle, Cardinal Bondi, died, the see of Imola became vacant, and Chiaramonti exchanged Tivoli for Imola; shortly afterwards he was made Cardinal. As Cardinal-Bishop of Imola, Chiaramonti gained a reputation for gentleness and firmness. He was very beneficent; and many of the exiled French priests were hospitably received by him. He always gave away the half of his income, and many times, because of his generosity, he found himself quite at a loss for means. When he had to travel to the Conclave at Venice, he was obliged to borrow the money for the journey from another cardinal.

As Bishop of Imola, Cardinal Chiaramonti had taken a step which set most of his colleagues against him; but it was precisely the thing which had awakened the sympathy of Maury and Ruffo. In 1797 when the French, before the peace of Tolentino, invaded Italy, many members of the hierarchy fled; but the Bishop of Imola was one of the few pastors who remained with their flocks. On 2nd February 1797, the day after war had been declared against the Pope, French troops passed through Imola, and they took up their quarters in the palace of Chiaramonti.² When Bonaparte came to Ancona, the bishop of which had fled, he said to those who brought him the keys of the city: "The Bishop of Imola, who is also a cardinal, has not fled; I did not see him on my way through, but he is at his post."³ At Christmas 1797 Chiaramonti preached a sermon which he afterwards published in print.⁴ After having spoken of the birth of Christ at

¹ Seb. Brunner: *Cl. Maria Hoffbauer und seine Zeit*, 23f.

² *Napoléon I. : Mémoires*, par Montholon (Paris 1825) IV, 6.

³ D'Haussonville I, 28.

⁴ Fragments of it are found in Italian in Botta, but it is printed complete amongst the documents in D'Haussonville I, 355-371 in the translation of Grégoire.

Bethlehem, he exhorted the congregation to appreciate the Divine favour, which was shown to them in the proclamation of the glad tidings. Christianity, he said, is the true liberty; but liberty is something different from the disintegration of society and the anarchy which confounds evil and good. True liberty creates peace and happiness; but peace is a daughter of civil order, and is only to be found where there are authorities to whom obedience is paid. Therefore the Catholic religion teaches that to resist the magistrate is to resist God. "The democratic rule which now is introduced among us," that is, the Cisalpine Republic, "is not opposed to the principles which I have set forth; it is not against the gospel; it demands on the contrary the lofty virtues, that are only to be attained in the school of Jesus Christ." How the virtues flourished in the free States of ancient heathendom—in Sparta, Athens, and ancient Rome! Even the Fathers of the Church spoke of them with admiration. Our virtues will make us good democrats, "but of the kind who work without an afterthought for the common weal, who renounce hatred, dishonesty, and ambition, and who are as careful to respect other people's rights as to fulfil their own duties. Thereby the true equality is also established, the equality which teaches man, what he owes to God, to himself, and to his equals." An absolute external equality of endowments and of wealth is not to be found, and never will be found. "Such a fanciful, arithmetical equality, if I may call it so, would turn everything upside down in the natural and moral world." But the virtues by themselves cannot enable us to do our duty in the right way. Only the gospel can do that—the gospel which creates Christian virtues. The beauty of the gospel struck even the author of *Émile*, as is clearly shown by his expressions in the confessions of the Savoyard priest. And the gospel teaches us obedience. "Let us humble ourselves under the designs of Providence. Do not think that the Catholic religion and the democratic form of government are irreconcilable. When you are wholly Christians you will be excellent democrats. Imitate our Saviour's obedience and humility by submitting yourselves to the laws and to the lawful authority!" The sermon concluded with an appeal to the priests to be patterns of Christianity and philanthropy; by that means all virtues would take root in those entrusted

to their care, and the honour of the Republic and the welfare of the citizens would thrive.

This was a different language from what people were accustomed to hear from Italian pulpits, but the preacher had nevertheless, at no point, forsaken Christian ground. He had pointed out that liberty and equality can only flourish with Christianity as their presupposed foundation, and he had unsparingly refuted the false view of these conceptions. Artaud may be right, when he says that the schoolmaster is to be seen throughout this sermon; it is cold and clear. But Botta testifies that "these words, spoken with great amiability by so distinguished a man, pacified men's spirits, did their hearts good, and helped to found the new order of things."¹ Such a sermon, however, was not a high road to St Peter's Chair. Napoleon calls it somewhere a Jacobin discourse,² and amongst the cardinals Chiaramonti was regarded as tainted with republicanism. He was, moreover, somewhat young; a Pope of sixty gave no assurance of a speedy change in the papacy.

This remarkable sermon was to Maury and Ruffo the best indication that Chiaramonti ought now to be made Pope. Bonaparte had returned; he had been made Consul and had commenced a new Italian campaign. If he were victorious, it was important that St Peter's Chair should be occupied by one who had gained beforehand the respect of the Consul, and who was not a declared enemy of the new order of things. Bellisomi was after all a stiffneck, Mattei an Austrian mercenary, but Chiaramonti was a man with whom a Republic and a Frenchman could deal. Ruffo agreed with Maury in this view; Chiaramonti's election would be a blow to Austria, and so Naples would be satisfied.

But from the wish for Chiaramonti's election to getting him elected was a long step. It encountered at once a real obstacle in the ambition of Cardinal Antonelli. Maury broached the subject in a confidential conversation which he had one day with Consalvi, as they walked together in the exercise ground of the Conclave.³ The secretary thought the

¹ Botta V, 136. Cp. Theiner: *Histoire des deux concordats* (Paris 1869) I, 66.

² *Mémoires*, par Montholon VI, 42.

³ Consalvi I, 251.

suggestion excellent, and encouraged Maury to go to work upon it, although he was not blind to the difficulties caused by Cardinal Antonelli's ambition, and by the "youth" of Chiaramonti. They agreed that Consalvi should privately enquire of Braschi whether it was likely that the party which he led, and which still clung to Bellisomi, would give their votes to Chiaramonti, who himself belonged to the party. If Braschi would guarantee this, they were at once sure of about one-half of the votes. It would be more difficult to win the opposite party, which zealously clung to Mattei; but if Antonelli, the leader of the party, were won, it was not too much to hope to win the rest. But how was he to be induced to favour Chiaramonti's election? If Maury went straight to him and proposed it, he would be offended because it was not his own idea. It had to be done underhand. Maury's conclavist, the Abate Pinto Poloni of Rome, was on good terms with Cardinal Antonelli, and often talked with him. Maury and Consalvi accordingly instructed Pinto Poloni to go to Antonelli, and, in the course of conversation, mention Chiaramonti as a candidate for the Papacy, and hint at the likelihood of his election being carried. They expected that Antonelli would not scruple to pass off the idea of a simple conclavist as his own.

This plan was put in action. Antonelli fell into the trap, and began at once to advocate eagerly the cause of Chiaramonti within his own party. At the same time Consalvi went to Braschi and suggested to him the election of Chiaramonti. Braschi thought the idea an exceedingly happy one, but he doubted if the opposite party would agree to it. To escape suspicion, it was arranged that Braschi should wear the appearance of being greatly surprised, but nevertheless wholly indifferent, in case Antonelli should speak to him about Chiaramonti's election. The play went off very well; there remained only one little knot to untie. Cardinal Hrzan hesitated on account of Austria and the Legations. He had no acquaintance at all with Chiaramonti, and he felt bound in any case to sound him before he could give him his vote. A visit to Chiaramonti's cell taught him that the Bishop of Imola had the same respect for the treaty of Tolentino as for the lawful authorities in the Cisalpine Republic,

and that he cared more for the maintenance of the spiritual authority of the Church than for the preservation of the temporal power. It was also a comfort to Cardinal Hrzan to notice that Chiaramonti had only entertained a passing thought, if any, of the possibility of being made pope, and accordingly he had not provided himself with a Secretary of State. Yet Hrzan was not at all sure what attitude to adopt towards the election of the Bishop of Imola beyond despatching a courier to Vienna forthwith, to receive orders from Baron Thugut. But this time the cardinals would not wait to receive the word of command from the Emperor. On 12th March came that confusion in the Conclave which generally betokens that the end is in sight; and in the evening of 13th March Braschi's party went to Chiaramonti's cell to kiss his hand. After them came the unattached, and last, Antonelli with the Austrians,—the proud cardinal still under the impression that all this, like everything else, was his own doing. But Hrzan did not give up all hope for lost. He would not pay homage to Chiaramonti; he demanded that everything should be put off until the arrival of the courier from Vienna, but the cardinals would not hear of it. Then he began to intrigue afresh. He worked all night, and at every hour he brought forward a new candidate, but all in vain. After the kissing of hands the election was complete, and while Hrzan went restlessly from cell to cell, the Bishop of Imola sat quietly in his own, and wrote letters to the sovereigns, to the Papal Nuncios, and to Rome; and his servants were busily engaged in shortening the papal robes, which were too long for him.

At last the day dawned which, as Consalvi expressed it, put an end to the widowhood of the Church. On 24th March, the voting commenced at the usual hour, and all the votes were given to Chiaramonti. As soon as the election was accomplished, all the cardinals who sat on the same side as the newly-chosen Pope quitted their seats and left him by himself as a token of reverence. The Cardinal-Dean then went to the Bishop of Imola, and asked him in the usual way whether he accepted the election. Chiaramonti begged for a moment's pause in which to pray; but after the prayer he answered briefly that he accepted it with a

lively sense of his own unworthiness, and in confident reliance upon the aid of the cardinals. He was then asked what name he would assume as Pope, and he answered, that out of gratitude to his predecessor he would bear the name of Pius VII. After the acceptance of the election, the new Pope was led to the altar and vested in the papal robes. Thereupon the cardinals proceeded to adore him, and the chapel was thrown open that the conclavists also might pay their homage to the new Pope. While the Pope received it, Cardinal Doria informed the crowd, which had gathered in the little square in front of the church, that Chiaramonti had been made Pope under the name of Pius VII. After that, the Conclave was thrown open and the people admitted to kiss the Pope's foot. In the afternoon Pius VII. was carried in procession to the abbey church, and placed on the altar, where all the cardinals and the congregation knelt down before him, as the custom is, in silent adoration. Outside in the square two orchestras played, and in the evening the campanile, the dome and door of the church, and the whole monastery were splendidly illuminated. All the church bells rang, with short intervals, for three days in succession, and the Piazza of San Marco also was illuminated in festive manner, "but, nevertheless," says a newspaper of the time, "the rejoicing and interest was not nearly so great as might have been expected."¹ The Austrians in Venice did not even put candles in their windows.

In ordinary circumstances the Pope is crowned in St Peter's eight days after the election, and outside Rome the coronation is generally performed in the principal church of the place. Everybody therefore hoped that the Pope would be crowned in San Marco, and they expected to see the inhabitants and the official world of Venice gathered together in that large and splendid space. But the imperial agents in Venice dared not give permission. They said that they had made enquiries at Vienna, and had received no answer. Consalvi is not disinclined to believe that the communication which came from Vienna was to the effect that they should say that no answer had come, in order not to give

¹ *Allgemeine Zeitung*, 25th March 1800, cited in Gams: *Die Geschichte der Kirche Christi im 19ten Jahrhundert* I, 52.

a flat refusal. For the coronation was an expression of the temporal power of the Pope, and the Imperial Court preferred to think that the temporal power was at an end. Others have imagined that Austria refused the request for financial reasons, but that is improbable. Consalvi informs us that the devout Catholics in Venice were ready to bear all the expenses of the coronation, "so that it should not cost the Imperial Court a penny."¹ Pius VII. expressed to Cardinal Hrzan his surprise at the attitude of Austria, but the only answer he obtained was that the Cardinal had received no orders on the point. Accordingly, there was nothing else to be done but either to omit the coronation altogether, or to let it take place in the abbey church. Pius VII. chose the latter expedient, and on 21st March he was crowned in San Giorgio. A devout Venetian nobleman presented the chair in which he was carried, and the papal chaplains followed with the tiara. According to the ancient custom a tuft of cotton is thrice burned before the Pope, and at the same moment he is addressed with the words: "Holy Father, so vanishes the glory of the world!" A deacon removes the episcopal mitre from the Pope's head, and another places the triple crown upon it instead, saying: "Receive the tiara with the three crowns, and know that thou art the father of princes and the leader of kings, yea, the vicar of our Saviour Jesus Christ upon earth!" Thereupon the Pope thrice pronounces the blessing, and with this blessing is connected a plenary indulgence.²

A day or two after the election of the new Pope, Cardinal Hrzan came to Pius VII. and suggested that he should select Cardinal Flangini for his Secretary of State. Flangini was a faithful friend of Austria. The Pope answered that for the moment he had no state whatever, and therefore needed no Secretary of State; meanwhile he had entrusted current business to the secretary of the Conclave, Consalvi. Thereupon Hrzan endeavoured to persuade the Pope to pay a visit to Vienna, but he had no greater success upon that point. Pius VII. burned eagerly to get to Rome. The whole attitude of Hrzan showed that he was more the subject of the Emperor than of

¹ Consalvi I, 289.

² Petruccelli della Gattina I, 76.

the Church; and the Pope must therefore have had some considerable reluctance to overcome before he could consecrate him Bishop of Sabaria, or Stein am Anger. He did so, nevertheless, on the 8th of May, and on that occasion he delivered an address which gives evidence either of a very high degree of the spirit of the peacemaker, or else of a weakness that ill befits a pope. Could Pius VII. seriously think that the church at Stein am Anger, "renowned as the birthplace of St Martin of Tours," would receive an accession of honour from having so "tried" a pastor as Cardinal Hrzan?¹

As Pius refused to go to Vienna, an imperial ambassador, the Marchese Ghislieri, suddenly arrived at Venice. He explained to Consalvi, that the Austrian Court was willing to give back to the Pope his former territories with the exception of the three Legations, which the Emperor wished to retain. Consalvi made a provisional remonstrance against such a plan, but referred Ghislieri to the Pope himself. Pius declared that he would never give his consent to such a cession, and Ghislieri then met him with an amendment. Austria would be content with two of the Legations and a small strip of the third. When the Pope set himself equally against this proposal, Ghislieri grew angry and hastened off to Consalvi, to whom he vented his bitterness in complaints of this Pope, "who was so new to the trade." But Consalvi was quite unable to give the angry envoy any consolation. Ghislieri failed equally to obtain a hearing, when he expressed his Emperor's displeasure at the fact that Pius VII., as well as the cardinals before the Conclave, had acknowledged the Count of Provence as King of France. Pius listened with a smile to the complaints of the vehement ambassador.²

When everything was provisionally arranged, Pius VII. made ready to go to Rome. It was his intention to travel by land, but Austria forbade it. A journey through the Legations would be dangerous, for the inhabitants would undoubtedly pay homage to the new Pope as their legitimate sovereign. For this reason the Austrians proposed that the Pope should sail to Pesaro, the extreme point of the papal

¹ *Bullarium Romanum* XI, 26-28.

² Maury I, 411. Despatch to Louis XVIII., 12th July 1800.

territory. The frigate *Bellona* was set in order for this journey, and the Pope and his small circle went on board the poor ship, together with the Marchese Ghislieri, "as the Pope's jailer," says Consalvi. Pius VII. often related in after days, that the captain of a Turkish vessel had offered to accompany him, but that he had refused it.¹ The *Bellona* drew too much water, so that the guns had to be unshipped before the party could start, and the passage was exceedingly disagreeable. From Pesaro the Pope continued his journey by land, still accompanied by his "jailer," who was greatly depressed at Ancona to hear of the battle of Marengo. On 3rd July, Pius VII. made his entry into his capital, greeted by the enthusiasm of the people; and, on the spot where a crown had been offered to General Berthier, a splendid triumphal arch was erected in honour of the Pope. The Romans did all they could to show their devotion to the new pontiff; the Roman Republic had lasted too short a time to take much root among the people. The Pope's first steps were directed to the grave of the Prince of the Apostle, where he prayed. "No revenge, no hateful persecutions," says the Prussian counsellor of legation, Bartholdy, "stained the return of the Papal government. Pius VII. and his ministers showed gentleness and forgetfulness of the past both in 1800 and in 1814."²

On 11th August Consalvi was appointed Cardinal-Deacon, and the Pope made a speech³ on the occasion, in which he bestowed high praise upon the earlier life of the secretary of the Conclave, but especially upon his activities at Venice. On the same day, Consalvi was made Secretary of State or Prime Minister,⁴ and by that means became the life and soul of all the actions of the Papal See. It is doubtful whether Pius VII. could have found a better minister, for he and Consalvi supplemented each other well. Pius had lived far away from the world and its noise, and he knew but little of politics and diplomacy. Consalvi, on the other hand, was versed in political relations as only few ecclesiastics were, and gifted as still fewer with powers of statesmanship. "The whole of

¹ De Pradt: *Les quatre concordats* (Paris 1818) II, 195.

² Bartholdy, 27.

³ *Bullarium Romanum* XI, 33f.

⁴ Consalvi II, 115.

Italy greeted him as a worthy heir of the immortal political geniuses of Rome, who were half swans, half foxes, and who have accomplished more conquests with words than kings with the sword." Contemporary diplomatists applied to him what Sixtus V. said of Cardinal d'Ossat, the ambassador of Henry IV. to Rome: "In order to escape his observation, it is not enough to keep silence; you must refrain from thinking in his presence."¹ Pius VII. was gentle and amiable, and looked at everything on the bright side. He could lull himself to any extent with illusions; but when they burst, he could be more possessed with terror than was becoming for a man. Consalvi did not lay himself out so much to disappointments in happy times, and he had more firmness in times of misfortune. Both of them had great gifts for winning people. Pius VII. drew everyone to himself by the amiability which shone from his whole personality. Consalvi was, as the Romans called him, "a siren," whose strength lay in a charming courtesy and in his powers of persuasion. "If we could fix a pattern to serve for all popes, it ought to be that of Pius VII," says De Pradt.² It might be added, that for popes of the type of Pius VII. it must always be desired that they should have such Secretaries of State as Consalvi. This, however, must not be taken to mean that Pius was only a tool in Consalvi's hands, without will of his own, as has sometimes been represented. Consalvi won his master's absolute confidence by giving him every day exact and detailed information of everything that took place at home and abroad, so that he was constantly in a state of readiness for all events. But Pius VII. and his minister were not always agreed. When the Pope leaned his head on one side and looked fixedly in front of him, Consalvi knew that they differed so much in their views that it was useless to go further. Often did Pius VII. make many objections before he gave in to the persuasive arguments of the "siren," and Consalvi dared not gain too many consecutive victories.³ There was also a great difference in the way in which the two men looked upon the conditions

¹ Consalvi I, 329.

² *Les quatre concordats* II, 194.

³ Bartholdy, 67f.

of the time. The sympathy for liberty and for France, which the Bishop of Imola had displayed, was never quite renounced by the Pope. But Consalvi, who had been educated in the legitimist circle of the Cardinal-Duke, and was intimate with the aunts of Louis XVIII., was a conservative by nature, who had no feeling for notions of liberty, but only sympathy for the old *régime* in France. And there was, moreover, a deeper divergence still—Pius VII. was of a contemplative, religious nature; Consalvi's bent was more external and political.

CHAPTER IX

THE CONCORDAT WITH FRANCE

SHORTLY after the election of Pius VII., General Bonaparte crossed the Little St Bernard, and entered Italy. A few days before Pius left Venice, he made his entry into Milan, and before the Pope reached Rome, Bonaparte had won the victory of Marengo (14th June).

After the entry into Milan, Bonaparte gave orders that *Te Deum* should be sung in the churches, "as a thanksgiving for the deliverance of Italy from heretics and infidels." This was an allusion to the fact that the Austrians had accepted the help of the English to blockade the port of Genoa, and that of the Turks to bring provisions into Venice. On 5th June he spoke at Milan to the priests of the town. "I wished," he said, "to see you all gathered here that I might have the satisfaction of disclosing in my own person the feelings which I entertain for the Catholic Apostolic Roman religion. I am convinced that this religion is the only one that can bring true happiness to a well-ordered community, and lay firm the foundations of government. I assure you that I shall strive to guard and defend it at all times, and by all means. I look upon you as my dearest friends. I declare here before you, that if any one ventures to use any disparaging language about *our* common religion, or dares to show the smallest disrespect to your sacred persons, I shall hold him as a disturber of the public peace, and as an enemy of the common weal. As such, I shall punish that man in the severest and most notable fashion, even with death, if necessary. It is my intention that the Christian Catholic Roman religion in its entirety shall be maintained and publicly exercised, and that it shall have as full, as extensive, and as inviolable an

exercise, as it had at the time when I first entered this happy country. . . . France, by the lessons which she has learnt from misfortune, has her eyes at last opened; she has recognised that the Catholic religion is the only anchor that can give her stability amidst the surges and save her from the storm. She has, therefore, called back that religion to her bosom. I will not deny that I myself have had a share in this excellent work. I can give you this information, upon which you may rely, that the churches in France are being re-opened, that the Catholic religion there has regained its old splendour, and that the people look with reverence upon their sacred priests, who, full of zeal, are returning to their bereaved flocks. Let not the treatment of the late Pope cause you any fear whatever. Pius VI. owed the misfortunes which befell him partly to the intrigues of his counsellors, partly to the cruel policy of the Directory. If I should be able to talk with the new Pope, I hope to succeed in removing all the obstacles that may still hinder the complete reconciliation of France with the head of the Church."¹ This communication was not at all to be kept as a secret by the priests. Bonaparte's address was printed, in order "that not only Italy and France, but all Europe, might become acquainted with the designs of the First Consul"; and a week after the victory of Marengo and the truce with Melas, Bonaparte had the victorious banners blessed with great solemnity in the cathedral of Milan, "without paying any heed to what the atheists of Paris might say to it."

On the way from Marengo he came to Vercelli, and there he had an important meeting with the bishop of the town, Cardinal Martiniana, the last cardinal who had seen Pius VI. when the captive Pope passed through Crescentino.² On 25th June, Martiniana paid the victorious general a visit, which he returned the next day surrounded by the whole of his staff.³ He asked Martiniana to go to Rome and tell the new Pope "that he would make him a present (*lui faire cadeau*) of 30,000,000 of French Catholics; that he wished to

¹ *Correspondance de Napoléon I.* VI, 338f.

² Maury I, 308.

³ Maury's despatch to Louis XVIII. 12th July 1800, Maury I, 407f. Cp. Consalvi II, 352f., and Talleyrand I, 283f.

have religion in France ; that the intruded bishops and priests were a set of discreditable robbers, of whom he wished to get rid as soon as possible ; that there had formerly been too many bishoprics in the country, and that their number ought to be restricted ; that he wished for a fresh priesthood altogether (*un clergé vierge*) ; that some of the old bishops were held in little esteem in their dioceses, where they never resided ; that several had only emigrated in order to weave intrigues, and that he would never have such bishops back again ; their dismissal ought to be considered, and he would give them a suitable pension ; as time went on, he would secure for the priests an honourable but not luxurious living ; the worst paid bishop should have 15,000 francs a year ; the exercise of the spiritual jurisdiction of the Pope in France should hereafter be free ; the Pope alone should have the power of giving the bishops canonical institution, but they should be nominated by the possessor of the sovereign power ; finally, he would reinstate the Pope in the possession of all his dominions."

In this proposal of Bonaparte, made on 26th June 1800, lies the germ of the later Concordat. The news of the meeting between Martiniana and Bonaparte must, of course, have disturbed Louis XVIII. very much ; for several things seemed to indicate that the victor of Marengo would not be satisfied with being another General Monk. Maury, after communicating this proposal, writes cautiously : "One does not yet see anything that is monarchical in it, although, at the first glance, it might seem to be the first step to the throne." And as if he would comfort his King, whom he had already gone far towards betraying, he adds : "What strange bishops would not Bonaparte appoint ! Whence would he choose them, if indeed he does not mean to make use of them to crush religion altogether ? How will one be able to reconcile Catholicism with the decades, the oaths, and the unstable position of a state-paid priesthood, with divorce and other laws now in force, with the destruction of schools, seminaries, and so forth."

But Cardinal Maury can scarcely have thought that the difficulties which he thus piled up for the reassurance of his King were quite insuperable. Cardinal Martiniana, of whose powers Maury had but a poor opinion, sent his nephew, Count Altiaci,

to Rome with a copy of the proposal, and one of Bonaparte's couriers waited at Vercelli for Rome's answer.¹ Pius VII. immediately laid the important message before the cardinals, and these, according to Consalvi, had no doubt that they ought to grasp the outstretched hand, which opened a way to effect a settlement of religious affairs in a country where the revolutionary spirit had nearly extinguished religion. On 8th July, Maury reported to his King, that it was rumoured that Spina, Archbishop of Corinth *in partibus*, had been chosen to conduct negotiations with Bonaparte, and he promised to keep a vigilant eye on the matter.² On 16th August he related that a full congregation of cardinals had been appointed to prepare instructions for Spina, but that, in his opinion, a happy solution of this matter would be "exceedingly difficult to arrive at."³ Later on he told Louis XVIII. that he had at once put himself into communication with the Archbishop of Corinth, whom he found mild and moderate, but wanting in all theological and canonical knowledge, very badly informed about the French Revolution, but perfectly convinced that the Catholic religion could only be established in a monarchical France, and "full of zeal and admiration for the exiled King."⁴ Spina had, however, the usual weaknesses of the Italians;⁵ he thought it was the greatest folly to join a minority, and he was very distant with Maury, who was not much thought of in Rome. Maury, therefore, went out to Montefiascone, and there ascertained that the necessary instructions to Spina had been drawn up with the greatest secrecy, and that only Consalvi and two other cardinals had obtained knowledge of them, under oath of secrecy. Concerning this, too, he had a comforting word for his King: "This secrecy, which is disturbing to superficial people, in no way disturbs me. On the contrary, it reassures me. Your Majesty's acuteness will easily guess the reason."⁶

It was no easy task that was imposed upon the Archbishop of Corinth, and many rumours were spread about,

¹ The letter of Pius VII., of 10th July 1800, to Martiniana, amongst the documents in Theiner II, 15f.

² Maury I, 426.

³ *Ibid.*, 429f.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 449f. The despatch is dated 25th September.

⁵ See above, p. 201.

⁶ Maury I, 454f.

which were calculated to awaken doubt as to the sincerity of the First Consul's kindly feelings towards the Church.¹

It was, for instance, no secret that Bonaparte in 1797 in a speech at Luxembourg had classed religion, and monarchy, and aristocracy amongst the prejudices, which the French people should conquer. Yet he belonged in no wise to the most advanced section of the freethinkers. A few months after the peace of Campo Formio, he had commanded his sister Pauline, General Leclerc's wife, to have her new-born son christened in the Capucin church at Milan by a priest who had not taken the oath, before the celebration of the birth took place in the government palace.² While his friends, who had kept aloof from the excesses of the Revolution, held very radical opinions on religious questions, it was otherwise with him. He liked to converse with Monge, Lagrange, and Laplace on philosophical and religious matters, and he often brought them to confusion by his remonstrances against their unbelief. "My religion," he once said to Monge, "is very simple. I look upon this grand complicated splendid universe, and then I say to myself that it cannot have been produced by chance, but it must be the work of an unknown Almighty Being, who is as much above man as the universe is superior to our finest mechanism." It was the riddles of the world that brought him to approach religion. On another occasion he said: "My nerves are in sympathy with the feeling of God's existence."

A disciple of Voltaire might express himself thus, but a materialist never. Bonaparte was also far from sharing the materialist's view of the historical religions. When, for example, Volney concluded that all the positive religions rested on fraud and chimera because of the great differences between them, Bonaparte drew another conclusion. He found something of an universal religion behind the different specific religions, and this something was his religion. He was convinced of the truth of religion; but in the positive religions he saw only symbols and images of the true religion.

¹ For the following, cp. Lanfrey: *Histoire de Napoléon I.* (3rd edition, Paris 1869) I, 337f.; Thiers: *Histoire du consulat et de l'empire* (Paris 1845) III, 208f.; H. Taine: *Le régime moderne* (Paris 1894) II, 6f. *Correspondance de Napoléon I.* V. and VI. *passim*; and Chaptal: *Mes souvenirs sur Napoléon* (Paris 1893), 236f.

² *Mémoires du chancelier Pasquier* (Paris 1893) I, 151.

Nevertheless, the religious question for him, as for Voltaire, was not in the least a matter of sentiment; he approached it through logical conclusions. The memories of his childhood, Catholic Corsica, and his pious mother, all of which circumstances Thiers uses to explain his attitude towards the Church, certainly influenced him but little. He knew well that such religious memories might mean something to other people—thus he would not introduce Protestantism into France, because Protestantism had no associations for the French—but for himself it was otherwise. In him, mind and will were superior to sentiment, and we find in him but small trace of religious feeling. At Malmaison, one Sunday, he was touched on hearing the church bells of Rueil, but his emotion quickly gave way to a speculation as to what impression the familiar sound of the bells might make upon simple and believing people. In his attitude towards the positive religions he was above all a politician. To his mind they were of value only in so far as they might help him to reach the goal at which he aimed. On the banks of the Nile, he bowed to Muftis and Imams; on the plains of Lombardy he showed reverence for Catholic priests; but to him, the peculiarity of Islamism was only a curious dress; and the special features of Catholicism consisted only in certain ceremonies. His devotion ceased the moment his power was imperilled. He was, therefore, in the end led to desire a sort of Caliphate, that he might be sure of absolute submission in everything.

When he went to Egypt, he commanded his soldiers "to show the same respect to Muftis and Imams as they had shown in Italy towards Rabbis and Bishops." In a proclamation of 2nd July 1798, he says to the inhabitants of Egypt: "We also are true Mussulmans. Is it not we that have crushed the Pope, who said that war ought to be waged against the Mahommedans?" He even prides himself upon having "overturned the cross (*renversé la croix*)."¹ He has himself given us the key to the understanding of such language. "It might have been possible for circumstances to have converted me to Islam. . . . A change of religion, indefensible for private reasons, may be excused when immense political results follow. Henry IV. was right when he said: 'Paris is well worth a Mass.' Would not the dominion of the

East, perhaps the subjection of the whole of Asia, be worth a turban and a pair of slippers?"¹ It was greed of power and ambition that led him to flatter Islam—"charlatanism, but not of the common sort," as he himself said afterwards.² He dreamt a fantastic dream of an Oriental Empire. The dream was most powerful when he lay before St John of Acre.³ The hill tribes wished to join him, and the Arabic portion of the people needed a leader. If Acre fell into his hands he would hold the key to Damascus; Constantinople could not hold out in the West, and in the East India would lie open. An order of the day would suffice, he thought, to make all the French soldiers Mahommedans. He subsequently propounded the theory that polygamy, as permitted by Islam, is an effectual means of extinguishing racial differences by gathering the various races within the same family; and even Oriental slavery had to his mind a pleasing side, when he compared it to that of the West.⁴

Neither polygamy nor slavery, at the latter of which the French certainly became adepts, were enough to frighten the French soldiers from Islam; but there were other difficulties, as was shown by the strange discussion on the subject between Bonaparte and the Sheikhs at the great mosque.⁵ "Publish a Fetam commanding the people to obey me," said Bonaparte on that occasion. "Why do you and all your army not become Mussulmans?" answered the venerable Sheikh Sherkavi. "Do so, and 100,000 men will immediately rally to your banners. You will restore the old empire of the Caliphs, and become the Ruler of the East." "God," objected Bonaparte, "has not adapted Frenchmen for circumcision, and it is impossible for them to abstain from wine." "Circumcision is not absolutely necessary," answered the Sheikhs, "but every Mussulman who drinks wine goes to hell." Bonaparte asked the Sheikhs to consider whether some concession could not be made on that point. He received the answer: "You can be a good Mussulman without circumcision, and without abstaining from wine; but you

¹ Las Cases: *Mémorial* (Paris 1823) III, 111.

² Las Cases III, 110.

³ Las Cases V, 75f.

⁴ *Mémoires*, par Monthonon II, 260f.

⁵ Thibaudeau: *Napoléon Bonaparte* (Stuttgart 1828) V, 75f.; *Mémorial* III, 111.

must then compensate for the wine-drinking by good works, and especially by alms-giving." "Then we are all good Mussulmans and friends of the Prophet!" exclaimed Bonaparte. The Sheikhs thereupon issued the Fetam with regard to submission, and Bonaparte had the ground marked out for an immense mosque, bigger than the Jemel Azar, which was to be built in memory of the conversion of the army. By this means he gained time; but the intended wholesale conversion to Islam never took place, because the expedition to Syria failed. Menou was the only general who became a Mahommedan; he called himself Abdallah, and married an Egyptian wife. It was a sacrifice; but he hoped by that step to further the success of the expedition. The other generals felt no inclination to follow his example, and even the French soldiers smiled when they read the proclamations of Bonaparte, which had been translated into the figurative language of the East by Oriental poets. But the Arabs said of the foreign general, "Strong is his arm, and his words are honey."

The dream of an Eastern Empire was not realised; it was in the West that the ambitious dreamer was to raise up his throne. When he returned to France, he found, instead of Muftis and Imams, the Pope and the bishops, and with them negotiations had to be conducted in another way than with the Sheikhs at the great mosque. "People will say," as he then expressed himself, "that I am a Papist. I am nothing. I was a Mussulman in Egypt for the welfare of my people. I will be a Catholic here. I do not believe in religion. But the idea of a God"—here he raised his hands towards heaven—"who made that? Around this great name imagination has woven its legends; let us hold fast to those that have already taken shape."¹ A national religion was to his mind a form of inoculation, which might satisfy mankind's love of the miraculous, and at the same time be a security against charlatans and sorcerers. "The priests," he said, "are better than all the Cagliostros, the Kants, and all the dreamers of Germany." The existing religions had also, in his eyes, the advantage that both their direction and their strength were well known. And some religion is a national necessity.²

¹ Taine II, 6.

² Quoted by Taine II, 8, 19.

Society cannot exist without inequality of wealth, nor inequality of wealth without religion. When one man is dying of hunger beside another who has abundance, it is impossible for him to disregard this inequality, unless there exists an authority which says: "God so wills it!" Therefore Bonaparte found that he must of necessity strive for the recognition of a religion, and this, in his opinion, could only be Christianity in the form of Roman Catholicism.

But the religion of the French nation must be in the hands of the French government. In this respect the religion of the Pope presented certain difficulties, which had to be removed, and the Pope himself did not at that time feel much inclined to negotiate with the victorious general. Pius VII. had read in the *Moniteur* the Egyptian army orders of Bonaparte, and they gave him great offence. They confirmed the rumour current in Europe that Bonaparte had gone over to Islam. This rumour was repeated when Bonaparte returned, and his friends at Rome did all they could to make Pius VII. believe that the impious proclamations were mischievous inventions. As soon as Bonaparte's *entourage* perceived that he had designs with regard to the Church, some of them advised him to abstain, and to let religion alone. This, however, in his opinion, would be an unwise policy, because in that case Catholicism would become a dangerous power. Everything possible ought to be done to attach the priesthood to the new order of things and to break the last thread that still bound the country to the old royal line. Others wished him to place himself at the head of a French Church. But would he do that? He had a feeling that he would make himself ridiculous, if he, the soldier, were to play the part of a pope. Had not Robespierre become ridiculous by his worship of the Supreme Being, and the Directory by its Theophilanthropism? Others again advised him to introduce Protestantism. Were he to do so, he was of opinion that the country would turn against him. Francis I. might have introduced Protestantism; but in the year 1800 it was an impossibility. Protestantism was not the religion of France; past centuries had decided its fate in that country. "Have we Protestant associations?" he asked. "How can a man be moved by sermons, when he

has not heard them in his youth, and how little do the cold Protestant churches invite to devotion?"

There is an echo of the polemics of Bossuet in this objection. Bonaparte had the Latin writings of the Bishop of Meaux translated for his benefit, and at the same time he sought for thorough information regarding the Gallicanism of the Parliaments.¹ Before he began negotiations with the old hierarchy, which, to his mind, was too royalist, he had long conversations with Grégoire. But he soon discovered that the bishops and priests who had taken the oath, were sincere Republicans, who would scarcely follow him to the goal which he already had in view.² It was Bossuet's Catholicism, which on consideration he decided to establish in France. It could be reconciled with a war policy and with autocracy. He would not work for a servile Catholicism, which anxiously waited for the word from Rome, but for a freeborn Gallicanism, obedient to Rome in spiritual matters, but independent in church policy.

But it was far safer first to endeavour to win the Pope over than to raise at once the banner of Gallicanism. Catholicism, in Bonaparte's view, was the best religion, just because it had a pope. In 1797 he had written to his brother Joseph: "When the Pope is dead, you must do all you can to hinder the election of a new Pope and to bring about a revolution."³ Later, he came to think differently. "If there had not been a pope, it would have been necessary to create one for this occasion, just as the Roman Consuls in times of difficulty created a dictator."⁴ Bonaparte's victories in Italy would easily bring the Pope into his power, and thereby he would gain influence over the whole Roman Catholic world. The Papacy, which he had formerly called "a rusty old engine," now suddenly became "a lever of great importance"; the irreverent expression, "the old fox," which he had formerly used of the Pope, was now exchanged for "the Most Holy Father," and the "priestly mob" (*prêtreaille*) and the "weak brained fools" were now addressed and spoken of as venerable and holy men. When Cacault was sent as ambassador to Rome, he asked how the Pope should be treated. "As if he

¹ Taine II, 18.

³ *Mémoires du roi Joseph I*, 168.

² Gazier, 143.

⁴ Quoted in Taine II, 11.

commanded 200,000 men," Bonaparte answered; that is to say, as a power of the magnitude of Prussia. The generals were not capable of such a change of face, they had lived too long in the atmosphere of the Clubs. They feared, as Thiers says, the ridiculous position they might appear in at the altar. Consalvi in his despatches always describes Bonaparte as fighting alone against "the fury of the Jacobins and the laughter of the philosophers."¹ But just because he stood alone in this matter, he attached to himself the great mass of the people, and he had no wish to share either power or honour with others. He well knew that the philosophers would laugh at him, but he was convinced that the people would bless him.² And he needed the people's blessing in order to realise his dream. La Fayette guessed aright what was in his mind, when, on hearing of his ecclesiastical policy, he said to him: "Confess! You want the little flask broken over your head." A Concordat with the Pope was an indispensable preliminary for an Empire. Before power could be gathered into one man's hand, the religious division in France must be healed. The Concordat was a *mariage de convenance* between the Revolution, no longer very young, and old France represented by its old religion.³

Archbishop Spina was chosen to negotiate with the French government, because he had accompanied Pius VI. in exile, and had become acquainted with Bonaparte at Valence. He had expected to meet Bonaparte in Italy, but the general had been some time in Paris when the Archbishop finally started. Spina was accompanied on his journey by the former General of the Servites, Caselli, one of the most learned theologians of the Roman Church; they did not arrive in Paris till the month of November, 1800. The negotiations⁴ were conducted on

¹ See for example the despatch of 13th July 1801, in Theiner: *Histoire des deux concordats* (Paris 1869) I, 208.

² *Mémoires du Comte Chaptal*, 237.

³ Vinet: *Études sur la littérature française du XIX. siècle* (2nd edition, Paris 1857) I, 217.

⁴ For the history of the Concordat we have in Cardinal Consalvi's *Mémoires* (I, 399f.) a source of information which is at first sight of the highest order, inasmuch as the author was Papal Secretary of State and the moving spirit in all these negotiations. This source, however, must be used with great caution. It is unfortunate, as a matter of form, that the editor, Crétineau-Joly, has given us a French translation instead of the Italian text. And the contents themselves make it impossible to use

behalf of France by the Abbé Bernier, an energetic but exceedingly ambitious priest, who originally played an important part amongst the Royalists of Vendée, but had afterwards attached himself closely to Bonaparte, thereby hoping for promotion. It might have been thought that the First Consul could have found a better man for this difficult task ; but he could scarcely have found a priest possessed of a more soldier-like notion of obedience.¹

The programme which Bonaparte had proposed to the Cardinal of Vercelli served as a basis for the negotiations between France and the Papacy, which began on 8th November. The first important point in the negotiations was the formation of a new French episcopate ; but great difficulties lay in the

the *Mémoires* as a wholly trustworthy authority. They were composed at Reims in 1812, that is to say about ten years after the events which they relate. They are written in a very bitter spirit, during Consalvi's captivity in France, and it is evident that the author is strongly under the influence of passion. The papal librarian, Augustin Theiner, has enabled us (see above, p. 192) to criticise the *Mémoires* of Consalvi by means of his despatches and letters, which Theiner collected partly in the French Foreign Office and partly in the secret archives of the Vatican. With great skill he has connected these despatches by a thin thread of narrative so as to give us a clear sketch of the real state of affairs, and it is evident that not only did the angry Cardinal's memory fail him, but that his otherwise clear judgment was frequently obscured. Bonaparte, according to his account, would even then have been, what he in later years became, brutal in his treatment of the Church. But Theiner on the other hand goes much farther than he ought to do in his defence of Bonaparte. More than once it is evident, that Theiner's book was intended to please Napoleon III. by portraying the attitude of the first Napoleon towards the Pope as an example for the third. Even if Bonaparte was not such a brutal politician, he was even then, as he was throughout, a politician and nothing more in his attitude towards the Church. Theiner does not attach sufficient importance to the fact that the documents which he has collected are despatches, and as such, according to Consalvi's own language (Theiner I, 171), they had to be worded with great moderation, even if they were in cipher, because the cipher was pretty well known. No opportunity was therefore given for the expression of purely personal views, and in many places in the despatches the truth is only expressed with great reserve, as C. de Meaux (in the *Revue des questions historiques* IV, 7, 1869) immediately pointed out. If the *Mémoires* are a lens which magnifies the violence and recklessness of the First Consul, the despatches are a lens which minimise his faults. We must, therefore, in every single point weigh them against one another in order to get at the truth. We find also contributions to the history of the negotiations for the Concordat in Talleyrand's and Cardinal Maury's *Mémoires* so often referred to. Count Boulay de la Meurthe has diligently collected all the documents relating to this history ; and upon this collection, and upon despatches at Alcalà and in the French archives, Léon Ségur has based a detailed description of the origin of the Concordat.

¹ Ségur II, 60f

way. Bonaparte could not possibly allow the whole of the old episcopate to be reinstated. It would anger the country too greatly, and would be dangerous for his own projects, for the old bishops were all attached to the old *régime*. The reinstatement of the episcopate might easily become the first step towards the restoration of the old monarchy. From among the bishops who had not taken the oath, he could only select those who had maintained a moderate attitude, and who were not too much hated in Paris. The rest of them would have to be forced, with the aid of the Pope, to resign their episcopal position. As a precedent it was possible to point to the procedure of the bishops at the time when the Donatist movement in the early Church was quelled. Indeed Bernier even dared to point to the Council of Constance, which, for the sake of peace, deposed three popes. But, on the other hand, some of those who had taken the oath had to be included in the episcopate about to be created. It was possible to choose those who had taken a small part, or at least an honourable part, in the Revolution, and who were well known for their moral purity. The people would never consent to the choice of bishops, unless those who had advocated liberty were included amongst the number. But would Rome consent to this, and what conditions would she impose?

Further, an agreement had to be arrived at as to the temporal position of the priesthood. The church property had been confiscated, and there could be no question of giving it back; but could Rome acquiesce in such a "robbery" of the "gifts of the faithful" and the "heritage of the poor?" Spina proposed at the outset to reintroduce tithes; but it would have been certain to provoke new disturbances. The abolition of the tithes was to many Frenchmen one of the best achievements of the Revolution, and their reintroduction in the France of the period was an impossibility.

Finally, a Concordat required a term to describe the position of the French people towards the Catholic religion. Catholicism could not be called "a State religion"; but even such a term as "the religion of the majority," used of the Catholic religion, would encounter much opposition. Mirabeau had once expressed himself against all such terms, as containing either the notion of privilege or else merely statistical information,

and so being either inadmissible or superfluous. This last point, which obviously had to be settled in the first article of the Concordat, became therefore a special point of contention. At the first audience Bonaparte had told Spina that he would again make the Catholic religion the ruling one (*dominante*) in France,¹ but it was not long before Spina discovered that the First Consul had no intention whatever of fulfilling his promise.

It was altogether very difficult to arrive at an agreement. Spina rejected one proposal after another,² and it soon became evident that he had not sufficient instructions. After having frightened and threatened the Archbishop who was not furnished with sufficient powers, Bonaparte arrived at the conclusion that it would be best to send the fifth edition of the proposed Concordat to Rome. Cacault was despatched, provided with full powers for both ecclesiastical and political negotiations; and the intention was, that the proposal, after having been signed in Rome by him and by a representative of the Pope, should be returned to Paris, to be ratified by Spina within twenty-four hours after the arrival of the courier.³ Not before 10th March 1801 did the courier arrive at Rome with this fifth proposed Concordat. He also brought with him, as a token of friendship, the sacred image of Loretto, which the French at a former time had carried away. The Pope immediately summoned together twelve of the cardinals and laid the proposal before them; but it did not please the princes of the Church, and it was therefore returned, together with an explicit statement of the reasons that led to its rejection. Cacault, although an old Republican, was devoted to Pius VII. and Consalvi. He wrote at the same time a letter to Talleyrand, in which he assured him that the proposal was rejected not from any evil intention, but because people in Rome were "awkward, slow by nature, and theologians by profession; still there was hope that things might by degrees improve."

But Bonaparte would not wait any longer.⁴ Cacault was

¹ Séché II, 67.

² These proposals are printed in Séché II, 214f.

³ Séché II, 99.

⁴ Consalvi I, 316f. Séché II, 115f.

ordered to break off diplomatic relations, and to leave Rome, if the Pope did not within five days agree to the proposal as it stood. This order reached Cacault on 28th May, and on the same day Consalvi received letters from Spina and Bernier, announcing Bonaparte's decision. Consalvi was so overcome by the news that he had to take to his bed. In the evening Cacault was admitted, although the Cardinal was in bed with high fever. Consalvi assured Cacault that it would mean death to the Pope if Bonaparte's threats were carried out. But the French delegate could do nothing else but inform the Papal Court next day of France's ultimatum.

Pius VII took the matter more serenely than his secretary had expected, and he showed then, as always, a real and true piety under misfortune. But he dared not sanction the proposal as it stood, and a breach was therefore inevitable. Cacault then advised that Consalvi should be sent to Paris; it would, he thought, flatter Bonaparte to see a cardinal and a Papal Secretary of State seeking audience in the Tuileries, and possibly the persuasions of "the Siren" might make the general once more disposed to be friendly. Trusting to Cacault's friendship, and his knowledge of the situation, both the Pope and the cardinals agreed to this proposal. On 3rd June, Consalvi presented to Cacault the Papal rejection of the proposal, but next day he and Cacault left Rome in the same carriage. They hoped thereby to prevent the disquietude which might easily arise if it became generally known that a breach had occurred between Rome and France. Cacault relates how Consalvi did all he could on the journey to make known to the people that it was the French ambassador with whom he was sharing a carriage on such friendly terms. They travelled to Florence, where Consalvi met Murat, with whom he spent a day "in the greatest amity." Cacault remained in Florence, but Consalvi continued to journey to Paris as quickly as possible. It caused him much pain as he travelled to see many churches destroyed, and others dedicated to Youth, Friendship, Commerce, Power, and the like.

On 20th June, Consalvi arrived in Paris at night, and put up at the Hotel de Rome, where Spina and Caselli lived. Next day he reported to Cardinal Doria, who had been made Papal Secretary of State for the time being, that he had found Spina

occupied in examining a sixth proposal for a Concordat not very different from the fifth rejected at Rome.¹ Bernier came at once, on the morning after Consalvi's arrival, to arrange for the audience with Bonaparte, who wished to see the Cardinal as soon as possible. After receiving Bonaparte's orders at Malmaison, Bernier returned with the message that the Cardinal could be admitted the next day at seven in the evening; he added that Bonaparte wished to see him in the dress worn by the cardinals at Rome. The Master of the Ceremonies fetched Consalvi from the hotel, and drove in through the big gate of the Tuileries to the *salon* of the ambassadors. Consalvi, dressed in black with red stockings and red skull-cap, was then led up the grand staircase, and through several rooms where troops saluted him. In the last ante-chamber he was received by Talleyrand, who accompanied him to the *salon* where Bonaparte awaited him.² The First Consul, who was surrounded by ministers and a great many officials placed with theatrical effect, advanced a few steps, with Talleyrand beside him, to meet Consalvi. He addressed him in gentle and calm tones; at the beginning he was rather grave, but by and by he became smiling and lively. He spoke of the Pope with much friendliness, but with regard to the ecclesiastical negotiations he offered no bright prospects. A new proposal had been drawn up, which must be accepted within five days. Very important considerations forbade him to grant the least delay. If the proposal were not agreed to, he would break off negotiations and introduce a national religion. He added that he had the most certain means of obtaining success in such an undertaking. Consalvi answered, "respectfully, but also with the assurance which innocence and truth inspires"; but he could not manage to get the respite extended. Nevertheless, he derived the impression from the whole reception that it was very solemn, and intended to do great honour to the Pope.

What did the First Consul mean by his ambiguous expressions about the adoption of a "national religion," which he hoped to succeed in introducing? As we learn from Consalvi's despatch that Talleyrand stood by his side when he uttered this threat, we may conclude that he referred to the synod of

¹ Despatch to Doria, Theiner I, 170f.

² Séché II, 137f.

the bishops and priests who had taken the oath, which assembled a week later in Paris. Shortly before Consalvi arrived in Paris, Bonaparte had had a conversation with a bishop, who is characterised by Grégoire as one "who was unyielding in his devotion to religion and to liberty, who had never flattered the possessor of power, and who was therefore persecuted by him, and was afterwards the object of the despot's fierce anger."¹ There is no doubt that this bishop was Grégoire himself. The conversation was opened by the First Consul, who said: "Catholic France is divided into two parties; in order to unite them I intend to make a Concordat with the Pope. Give me your sincere opinion about it." The bishop answered that the schism was much to be regretted in itself; but that to remove it no Concordat was needed. The Catholic Church had stood for 1,200 years without Concordats; she had apostolic traditions and canonical authority, and these were enough; the first four ecumenical Councils were at that time as much honoured as the four Gospels. Thereupon the bishop criticised the Concordat between Francis I. and Leo X.; and his criticism was especially directed against the privileges accorded to high-born bishops, and against the withdrawal of the election of bishops from the laity. It was the programme of those who had taken the oath which the bishop thus explained. Bonaparte listened patiently to the learned explanation, but the party of the bishops and priests who had taken the oath formed only the second alternative in his designs. They had no pope. It is true he gave permission to hold a new Constitutional Council in Paris; but it was nothing more than a political move.² In his *entourage* it was mostly Talleyrand who spoke up for the Constitutional clergy, and Bonaparte in religious matters had not much confidence in the former Bishop of Autun. It seemed to him, therefore, quite a seasonable thing that Talleyrand, shortly after the arrival of Consalvi, should leave Paris to take the baths.

The negotiations between Bernier and Consalvi proceeded meanwhile, and Bonaparte often discussed the questions with Consalvi personally in Bernier's presence, but it was not possible to reach entire agreement. Bonaparte would not

¹ Grégoire : *Essai historique sur les libertés de l'église gallicane* (Paris 1818), 158f.

² Ségur II, 124f.

allow it to be stated in any way in the Concordat that *the government* professed the Catholic religion. He several times called attention to the fact that he himself was born a Catholic, and that he had never rejected Catholicism. Consalvi thought at such moments that it would be unwise and dangerous, tempting though it was, to remind him of the proclamations in Egypt. When Consalvi one day expressed his dislike for the Constitutional Synod, Bonaparte said, with a smile: "When you cannot agree with God, you must try to come to an understanding with the devil." However, on 3rd July, Consalvi was able to report home that there appeared to be agreement upon certain important points.¹ The only misfortune was that the First Consul, with the best will himself in the matter, had to take into consideration all shades of opinions. The official class, the philosophers, the libertines, and the majority of the officers, were against the Concordat, and they declared openly to Bonaparte that a Concordat would be a sure means to restore the monarchy. It was in view of the strength of this resistance that Consalvi exclaimed: "I was prepared for rain, but not for such a deluge."

At last the happy moment seemed to draw near when the Concordat might be signed, and this ceremony was fixed for 13th July.² Consalvi, Spina, and Caselli were to sign on behalf of the Pope; Joseph Bonaparte, Cretet, *Conseiller d'Etat*, and Bernier on behalf of France. The signing was to take place in Joseph Bonaparte's house. Consalvi wrote in a despatch to Doria, that this happy consummation was due to two circumstances—Talleyrand's absence, and the approach of 14th July. This day, with its festivities in memory of the storming of the Bastille, was in the future, according to Bonaparte's design, to be the anniversary of the peace between France and the Pope. He asked in the above-mentioned despatch to have the Concordat returned as soon as possible with the signature of the Pope, but he expressed at the same time a fear lest new difficulties should arise. And they arose.

Unfortunately, Bonaparte had already, on 10th July, in an announcement about the festivities on the day of the Bastille,

¹ Postscript to the despatch of 2nd July, Theiner I, 194.

² Consalvi I., 370f. Consalvi's despatch to Doria in Theiner I, 221, and *Mémoires du roi Joseph I*, 85f., 200f.

declared that "the scandal of religious dissensions should soon be put an end to." On 13th July, he had further caused the following announcement to appear in the *Moniteur*: "Cardinal Consalvi has been successful in the negotiations which the Holy See has commissioned him to conduct with the government." This was enough to set all the antagonists of the Concordat in motion. The synod of those who had taken the oath issued a sort of proclamation with the heading: "Liberty, Equality," which was a direct protest against a Concordat with the Pope. In spite of all precautions the contents of the Concordat had become generally known, so that in the evening of 13th July an invective against it was handed to Bonaparte. At the same time "Citizen," formerly Count Blanc d'Hauterive, a friend of Talleyrand and Grégoire, had made a new sketch of a Concordat, which was of such a nature that the Pope would never be able to agree to it. They attempted to get Bonaparte to place this new draft before Consalvi as the ultimatum of the French government, since the one which Consalvi and Bernier had agreed upon "brought the negotiations back again to the first difficulties."¹ On the morning of 13th July, Consalvi received a communication from Bernier, asking him to meet him at Joseph Bonaparte's in the afternoon of the same day. He enclosed a copy of the Gallican Concordat which the enemies of the Papacy wished to enforce. Afterwards the Abbé Bernier arrived himself, to pacify Consalvi with the assurance that everything would end happily in spite of the intrigues of the opposition.

At four o'clock Consalvi, accompanied by Spina, Caselli, and Bernier, repaired to the house of Citizen Joseph Bonaparte in the Rue du Faubourg Saint Honoré. The First Consul's brother received them cordially and declared that the matter would soon be settled, inasmuch as everything was agreed upon. They seated themselves round a table, and when a little dissension as to who should sign first had been settled in favour of Consalvi,² he took the pen to sign his name. On running his eye through the first articles, he discovered

¹ Cp. D'Hauterive's letter in Theiner I, 217.

² Consalvi I, 370. In the official text in Portalis' *Discours*, J. Bonaparte's name is placed before Consalvi's, and Cretet's before Spina's, a fact which, according to Cacaull's despatch (Theiner I, 414), created great dissatisfaction in Rome.

immediately that it was the Concordat of D'Hauterive which was placed before him, and he therefore positively refused to sign. Joseph and Cretet, who was also present, did not seem to know anything of it, and at their earnest entreaty Consalvi declared himself ready to draw up then and there a proposal for a new Concordat. They began forthwith, and after nineteen hours incessant work, they finished it. Only as to the first article were they unable to agree. The Pope had explicitly demanded as the main points (*i due cardini*) liberty of worship for the Catholic Church and permission to hold their services publicly. This last point had encountered opposition from Bonaparte. He wished to have the paragraph concerning it drafted as follows: *Son culte sera public, en se conformant toutefois aux règlements de police*, a form which Consalvi had consistently opposed, because he feared that the Church would thereby be subjected to the arbitrary action of the police. Consalvi proposed that the rest of the Concordat should be signed, but that this article should stand over until Pius VII. had given a decision. Since the Concordat could not be published without his final signature, such an arrangement could do no harm. Joseph hastened to the Tuileries with the new draft, but an hour later, he returned with the tidings that the First Consul had torn up the Concordat and thrown the pieces into the fireplace.¹ He would have the Concordat as last proposed, or else break off all negotiations. It was two o'clock when Joseph returned; at five the banquet in honour of the Bastille day was to take place, and during that festivity Bonaparte wished to be able to report either the completion of the Concordat or a breach. For two consecutive hours Joseph and Bernier exhausted every means to induce the Cardinal to give in, but he refused. At four he returned to the hotel to dress, and an hour later he presented himself at the Tuileries with Spina, for the banquet.

He had scarcely entered the room where the First Consul was, before the latter said to him in a scornful voice: "So then, Monsieur le Cardinal, you have wished for a rupture. Very well! I have no need of Rome. I will act independently. If Henry VIII., who had not a twentieth

¹ Consalvi I, 385f.

part of my power, could successfully change the religion of his country, surely I can do the same. When I change the religion of France, I change it at the same time in nearly the whole of Europe, so far does my influence reach. Rome will discover what losses she has suffered; she will weep over them, but she will find no compensation for them. You may go away; it is the best thing you can do. You wished for a rupture, and since you wish for it, you shall have it." In answer to these words which were uttered so loudly that everybody could hear them, Consalvi said that he could neither transgress his authority nor give his consent to anything contrary to the principles of the Holy See.¹ Thereupon, the First Consul commenced a conversation with the Cardinal, and demanded the adoption of the article in question just as it stood without the alteration of a single syllable. Consalvi repeated that he would never subscribe to it as it stood. "Well, then," said Bonaparte in conclusion, "I have a right to say that you have sought a breach, and that I look upon the matter as closed. Rome will come to feel it, and to weep tears of blood over this breach." While uttering these words, Bonaparte had approached the Austrian ambassador, Count Cobenzl. He turned towards him and repeated his threats against Rome, adding that he would alter the ways of thinking and religion in every European state. He would certainly not be the only one that would turn his back upon the Roman Church (*à se passer de l'église Romaine*). He would soon set Europe on fire from top to bottom, and the blame and the hurt would fall upon the Pope. Thereupon he mingled with his guests, and repeated similar words to several of them.

Afterwards, Count Cobenzl came to Consalvi and remonstrated with him anew. When Bonaparte saw it, he joined them and said it was waste of time to try to overcome the obstinacy of the Papal minister. Cobenzl, however, contrived to give

¹ Crétineau-Joly has here perverted Consalvi's Italian manuscript (see it verbally given in Séché II, 154) by making Bonaparte ask: "When are you leaving?" and Consalvi answer: "After dinner." Maynard defends this perversion by exclaiming: "Que l'écrivain de nos jours, qui ne se sentirait pas fier d'avoir trouvé un mot si bien venu et si bien en place, se charge de jeter à Crétineau la première pierre," an exclamation that bears witness to a peculiar interpretation of the duties of an editor of *Memoires*.

such a turn to the conversation that Bonaparte gave permission for a new meeting next day as a last attempt, and Consalvi arranged to meet the other representatives next day at noon at the house of Joseph Bonaparte. In hopes of a successful result of this meeting Bonaparte allowed the Papal banner to keep its place amongst the flags of friendly powers which decorated the balloon that ascended in the evening from the Champs Elysées. This was the first time since the Revolution that the Papal flag had floated over French soil.

The Cardinal spent a restless night. In the morning Spina returned mournful and bewildered. Padre Caselli had come to him early and had said that he dared not be a party to making any further resistance, and, as Spina knew that Caselli was a much more learned theologian than himself, he was now quite of the same opinion. If Consalvi did not agree with them that they ought to give in, they would give a separate vote. This was but little encouraging to Consalvi; but he determined in spite of all to maintain his position, and he asked his two helpers to conceal their inclination to submit as long as possible. The meeting at Joseph's house began at twelve o'clock, and only at night did they come to an agreement; Consalvi had got the article altered as he desired,¹ and Joseph had decided to sign it in this form, hoping to be able to induce his brother to accept what he had done. The signing took place at two o'clock in the morning—at the same time as Joseph's wife gave birth to a daughter, who, although good fortune was prophesied for her by the envoy of the vicar of Christ, met with but a poor fate.² The next day Joseph came to Consalvi and told him the result of his conversation with his brother. Bonaparte had at first been very angry, then he had become absorbed in thought, and after a long silence, he had promised to accept the Concordat as it stood. The idea had just then occurred to him of carrying his war through by the so-called "organic articles."

The Concordat of Messidor 26th in the ninth year (15th July

¹ "Son culte sera public, en se conformant aux règlements de police que le Gouvernement jugera nécessaires pour la tranquillité publique." Thus he hoped to escape the arbitrariness of the police.

² *Mémoires du roi Joseph I*, 86: "Veuve à trente ans, séparée de son père, proscrire comme tout le reste de sa famille."

1801)¹ opens with the declaration that the Roman Church is "the religion of the majority." As such it must have liberty of worship and a public service within certain limits, which are mentioned. There is to be a redistribution of the French dioceses,² and the Pope undertakes to notify the French bishops that he confidently expects, that, "for the sake of peace and unity, they are ready to undergo any sacrifices, even if it were of their own sees." If the bishops, contrary to expectation, refuse to make such a sacrifice they must be compelled to do it. The First Consul shall, in the course of three months, nominate new bishops and archbishops to the dioceses according to the new divisions, and the Pope shall give them canonical institution according to the ancient forms; but no period of time was fixed for this. Bishops and priests are to swear on the Gospel allegiance to the Republic, and in all churches the following prayer shall be recited at each service: *Domine, salvam fac Rempublicam. Domine, salvos fac consules.*

The bishops are to select the parish priests; but their choice must only fall upon men who are pleasing to the government. All the necessary churches shall be placed at the disposal of the bishops, but the Pope is to promise that neither he nor his successors will in any way injure the owners of the church property which has been confiscated. The government will, on the other hand, grant to the ministers of the Church suitable stipends, and French Catholics have permission to make gifts to the Church. The First Consul shall enjoy the same privileges as the ancient government, but if any of his successors leaves the Catholic Church, a new arrangement must be made. The binding document shall be delivered in Paris within the course of forty days.

This Concordat was, as Count Chaptal says,³ the most daring enterprise which Bonaparte carried out during the first years of his rule. "The idea of giving to the Pope jurisdiction once more over Frenchmen was so repulsive to the prevailing state of mind and public opinion that he alone could have

¹ Printed in Theiner I, 421f, and in Ollivier: *Nouveau manuel de droit ecclésiastique*, 107f.

² Strangely enough the ancient see of Remi is not to found any more according to the new arrangement. Was its abolition a sacrifice to the hatred of the monarchy? [The Archbishopric of Reims was refounded in 1817.]

³ Chaptal, 236.

formed the plan and carried this great work through." The Abbé de Pradt, indeed, relates that Napoleon repeatedly called the Concordat "his greatest mistake"; but here, as on many other points, this tainted source of information is refuted by Napoleon's own expressions at St Helena.¹ It can with greater reason be maintained that this daring move was the beginning of the extraordinary success of the First Consul. Bonaparte, in fact, reaped as great political advantage from the treaty of peace with the Pope as Constantine the Great and Pepin from their alliance with the Church.

Yet the advantage lay still more with Rome, and on this account Pius VII. remembered to the end "this saving deed of Christian heroism," in spite of all the hard things which he experienced later on at Napoleon's hands. Rome did not only regain for the Church a firm footing in France; but by the Concordat the Curia gained a victory in a land, from which up till now had gone forth the most energetic protest against the absolute power of the Papacy. The way in which Pius VII. forced the whole French episcopate to resign and submit to a complete rearrangement of all the sees, could only be defended on Bellarmine's theory of Papal Supremacy. In spite of his Gallicanism and his studies in Bossuet, Bonaparte inflicted by his action a deadly wound on the liberties of the Gallican Church, and Roman Ultramontanism could congratulate itself on having got the French government to accept the ultramontane theory of the supremacy of the Pope over the episcopate, and to silence every appeal to the old Gallican canon law. Later attempts of Bonaparte to revive Gallicanism had no lasting importance, but the Concordat was and remained a great victory for Ultramontanism.

When the negotiations about the Concordat were finished, Consalvi was received by Bonaparte in a farewell audience. When he entered in the cardinal's purple, Bonaparte could with difficulty keep his laughter back; "if a single one had laughed, we should all," says De Pradt, "have been in danger of falling into irrepressible laughter, like the gods of Homer."² Consalvi pointed out during the audience that the Papal See had shown clearly in this case that it did not at all covet temporal power or other worldly things, and the First Consul

¹ Séché II, 206f.

² De Pradt II, 267.

listened to him civilly and without impatience. The following day, however, he was recalled to the Tuileries, and Bonaparte asked him very searching questions about the Papal States. In the course of the conversation he remarked, in passing, that he had difficulty in choosing between the bishops who had and who had not taken the oath in the appointments to the new dioceses. Consalvi was much alarmed at this utterance, and maintained that it had been an understood thing during all the negotiations that none of those who had taken the oath should again become bishops, because they were not in communion with the Pope. Bonaparte answered coldly that he could not entirely pass them by, because a strong party was on their side. Consalvi maintained firmly that it would be impossible to give them canonical institution, unless, at any rate, they made ample apology; but Bonaparte wished to save them from humiliation. This conversation made bad blood, and the First Consul showed his anger some days later at a review by passing Consalvi in silence, as he stood at the head of the diplomatic circle. When Consalvi had drafted a Bull to accompany the publication of the Concordat, he finally obtained permission to leave, and on 6th August he arrived in Rome, "more dead than alive, overcome by fatigue and want of sleep." Bonaparte afterwards sent him a magnificent casket as a reward for his work, and both Spina and Caselli received presents. The Papal See was obliged to make a gift in return, but it was very difficult, for, as Cacault says in a despatch, "they have left the Pope nothing but the relics of saints, and that stuff is of little value now in France."¹ The Pope, however, did his best; Madame Bonaparte received a splendid rosary of *lapis lazuli*, with a cameo, surrounded by diamonds, "of the same kind as the Pope is accustomed to give to great princesses." So writes Cacault with evident satisfaction.²

The news of the conclusion of the Concordat, according to Consalvi, created great rejoicing in Paris, and outside France also it was welcomed by Catholics and Protestants.³ There were not a few Catholics, however, who were not at all

¹ Theiner I, 285.

² *Ibid.*, 294.

³ For instance in the Protestant journal, *Voix de la religion au XIX siècle*, at Lausanne. Vinet: *Etudes sur la litt. française* I. 216.

satisfied. The Royalists were very unwilling to see the Pope concluding a concordat with the Revolution, for the strife between revolutionary France and Rome had given them their firmest hope of the restoration of the old *régime*. In Italy the words went from mouth to mouth:

"To save his faith
Pius (VI.) lost his throne.
To save his throne
Pius (VII.) abandoned his faith."

The National Church Council at Paris was highly exasperated, but it was commanded to dissolve a few weeks after Consalvi's departure. It broke up with bitter denunciations of "the faithless and cunning Rome, which always derives benefit from everything,"¹ but yet with the promise that the bishops would apply for their discharge if the Pope publicly demanded it.² That the Freethinkers were not satisfied is natural enough. Many of them had hoped to attain freedom of belief in France as in North America, and from that moment they lost faith in the republican sentiments of Bonaparte. But what did Bonaparte think himself? He was the politician. With Consalvi and the Pope he touched the ecclesiastical chords, but to Cabanis he declared: "Do you know what the Concordat which I have recently signed means? It is a religious vaccination. In fifty years' time there will be no religion in France."³

On 25th July, the Concordat reached Rome, and there it was secretly placed before a congregation of cardinals and theologians to be examined by them. Some of the cardinals objected strongly to one or two of the articles, but it was from personal motives, which were ill-concealed behind a theological disguise; jealousy of Consalvi was for certain of them the real ground of their criticism.⁴ But in spite of these somewhat lengthy and wearisome discussions at Rome, the Papal envoy reached Paris, bringing the document, magnificently got up, and signed by the Pope, before the forty days had expired. Bonaparte was then occupied in reading Fleury's

¹ Theiner I, 369f.

² Séché II, 162.

³ Mme. de Staël: *Considérations sur la révolution française* (Paris 1818) II, 275f.

⁴ Séché II, 166f.

Church History, and the reading made it clear to him that it would now be very useful to him to have a Legate (*a latere*) sent to France. He saw from Fleury's account what power the Papal Legates had in the Middle Ages, how they had been like little popes in the various countries; if such a Legate, endued with sufficient authority, came to Paris, the First Consul would have him in his power, and then everything would be gained. He therefore asked the Pope to send a Legate to Paris, and suggested Cardinal Caprara for the post.¹ Caprara, Bishop of Jesi, then a man of sixty-eight years of age, had been nuncio at Cologne, Lucerne, and Vienna and was said to have Febronian sympathies. The Pope complied with the desire of the First Consul, and in the evening of 4th October, the Cardinal drove into Paris quietly, according to his own wish. The next day he had an audience with Talleyrand, and the latter communicated to him the happy news that Theophilanthropism in France was now entirely suppressed.

But difficulties were in store for Caprara like those which Consalvi had met with, and the Cardinal Legate had neither the Papal Secretary's genius nor his energy. The hard task had been entrusted to him of demanding the restoration of the Legations and of opposing to the utmost the appointment of those who had taken the oath as bishops under the new *régime*. Bonaparte had entrusted Portalis to conduct the negotiations on behalf of France. He was a Gallican by sympathy, a disciple of the Oratorians, well versed in canon law. Afterwards he became Minister of Public Worship. But the First Consul followed the business step by step. With his wonderful acuteness, he soon got on so far with it that Caprara could say of him: "He judges as if he were a canonist and theologian by profession." It was Bonaparte's wish that the publication of the Concordat should take place on Brumaire 18th (9th November), but it was impossible to have everything arranged

¹ Cardinal Maury, who was very angry at being forced, by the desire of France, to retire to Montefiascone, while the Concordat was being discussed at Rome, wrote in a cipher despatch of 20th August 1801 to Louis XVIII.: "Le chevalier d'Azara a insinué à Bonaparte de demander au pape pour cette mission extraordinaire le Cardinal Caprara, son ami, l'ami des français, par la protection desquels il se flattait de devenir pape, l'ami du feu Prince de Kaunitz, homme souple, faible, dépourvu de toute connaissance théologique et canonique."—Maury II, 160.

for that day. Both the bishops who had and those who had not taken the oath were to lay down their office; a Bull had to be published about the rearrangement of the dioceses; and finally the new bishops had to be nominated—a matter of great difficulty, because Bonaparte still insisted on choosing some of those who had taken the oath to be amongst the new bishops.

As soon as the Concordat was signed, the Pope sent a brief to the bishops of France, begging them to resign. Circumstances even forced him to ask their resignation within ten days.¹ The bishops who had not taken the oath, and who were in France, immediately obeyed the admonition, and the bishops who were in Italy at once followed their example. Only one of them, the Bishop of Béziers, first asked permission of Louis XVIII. to resign.² The French bishops who had been hospitably received in Spain, Switzerland, and Germany, likewise sent compliant answers forthwith to the Papal brief; but the eighteen bishops who had taken refuge in England hesitated. They criticised the Concordat sharply, and some of them doubted whether the Pope had any right to make such a demand upon bishops; others thought that he ought first to have obtained leave of Louis XVIII. Twelve of them would not submit for a good while—some of them probably under political influence from the English government, which did not wish to see the religious division healed, because it weakened the country. Their opposition encouraged Louis XVIII. to speak also, and on 6th October he sent from Warsaw to all the bishops in the kingdom a protest against the Concordat, whose wording he did not know.³ But this protest made an impression on only a very few of the bishops.

The bishops who had taken the oath, like most of the others, were not unwilling to resign their sees. With the exception of Savines of Viviers,⁴ they signed a joint letter, in which they declared themselves ready to make the heavy sacrifice freely and without reserve. But they said besides, that they wished to show to the Pope, as the successor of St Peter, the obedience

¹ Maury II, 235f.

² Theiner I, 345.

³ His letter in Séché II, 183f.

⁴ He wrote: "On a tant crié que nous étions *intrus*; j'appartiens à l'ancien et au nouveau régime; nous verrons quel sera l'*intrus* qui osera, sans mon aveu, gouverner mon diocèse."—Séché II, 176.

and submission that was due to him according to canons and holy decrees of the Church, and that they adhered firmly to the faith of the Apostles.¹ A distinction between the decrees of the Church and those of the Pope, and the acknowledgment of the "faith of the Apostles," sounded in ultramontane ears like "pure Jansenism," and the letter which they forwarded was not according to the formula that Rome had wished them to sign. Some of those who had taken the oath, moreover, in separate letters to Pius VII. used expressions which wounded the Pope, because, as Theiner puts it, they bore "the stamp of Jansenism." Thus Grégoire declared in his own name and another bishop's: "Although called by a free election, we only agreed after the utmost reluctance to take upon us the heavy burden of the episcopate and to receive the holy consecration; but we see with joy the moment approaching, in which we can quit our posts without doing harm either to the cause of religion or to that of the Republic. Our faith has always been the faith of the Apostles, to which God has given us grace to bear witness, even with the guillotine before our eyes."²

Since the episcopal sees were vacant, it was necessary to fill them again, and, according to the Concordat, the selection was placed in the hands of Bonaparte, while the canonical institution rested with the Pope. The rearrangement of the dioceses was first put in hand, and Bonaparte took an active share in it. He went into the most minute details, decided which churches should be the principal ones, and where the new parsonages should be placed. When he saw that ten metropolitans and forty diocesans were not enough, he generously added ten new dioceses, which the Cardinal Legate of course gladly accepted. Then the new bishops were selected. It must be said in praise of the old lawful bishops, that they did not intrigue to get back into office; most of them would not accept the new sees until a great pressure had been brought to bear upon them. Bernier, who had hoped to receive the Archbishopric of Paris as a reward for his services, had to content himself with Orleans, and there he died soon after, of grief at not having been made a cardinal.³

¹ Séché II, 176.

² The letter is given among the documents in Theiner II, 101.

³ Séché II, 193.

From the bishops who had taken the oath, Pius VII. required an explicit declaration, that "they adhered and submitted to the Pope's judgment concerning ecclesiastical affairs in France,"¹ or, in other words, that they acknowledged the Pope's condemnation of the Revolution and of the Civil Constitution of the clergy.

Bonaparte did not wish to go so far; but at Rome the demand of the Pope seemed too mild. A bogus *Moniteur* was printed, in which was seen a proclamation of Bonaparte to the Egyptians, in which he says that he has expelled the vicar of Jesus Christ on earth out of Rome.² The intention was to excite the popular mind; and there were those who suggested that Pius VII. should flee to Malta and seek help from the English, rather than come to terms with the ungodly First Consul.

At Paris the Pope's requirement was considered altogether exorbitant; those who had taken the oath were friends of the Revolution, and must at any cost be saved from humiliations. It was pointed out to Bonaparte that there were several of these bishops for whom public opinion demanded seats in the new episcopate, and there were moments at which it looked as if there would be serious disturbances in the capital. Bonaparte was compelled to abuse his power to eject fifty members of the Legislative Assembly, because they were enemies of the Concordat, before he could expect to get it approved by the majority of the Assembly. But the Pope was more difficult to deal with. Two out of the ten Constitutional bishops whom Bonaparte had singled out to receive French bishoprics again,³ were already reconciled to the Pope; but the other eight were not, and did not care about reconciliation. As soon as their nomination was communicated to them, they went to the Cardinal Legate on the morning of Maundy Thursday, to arrange for the canonical institution. Caprara showed them a letter addressed to the Pope, that contained amongst other things the above-mentioned expressions,

¹ Without such a declaration, says Cacaault in writing home, the Pope would think himself "perdu comme Honorius" (D'Haussonville I, 412). Supposing that he here gives a real utterance of Pius VII., we have in it the Pope's view of his heretical predecessor.

² Artaud: *Histoire du Pape Pie VII.* I, 164.

³ Séché II, 193f.

and he demanded that each of them should forward it, signed with his own name, before there could be any idea of institution. The bishops refused to sign a recantation couched in such strong language, but promised to draw one up themselves in a milder form. From Caprara they went to Portalis to complain, and afterwards to other powerful personages, and as they found support everywhere, they grew bolder.

At this point everything seemed about to break down again. The Legate dared not to give in to the request of the bishops, because it was against his instructions; Bonaparte neither could nor would agree to the requirement of the Legate, because its fulfilment would make the opposition to the Concordat far stronger. At this difficult juncture Bernier reappeared as mediator. He proposed that the bishops in his and another's presence should secretly and orally make the recantation which the Pope required; and both Caprara and Bonaparte agreed to this proposal. It is said that the eight bishops made the recantation in hot haste on Easter Even, in the presence of Pancemont, Bishop of Vannes, and of Bernier. But as Rome carelessly divulged the secret, in spite of the promise of silence, the eight bishops declared that they had never recanted in such a way. We are here placed in the difficulty of doubting the veracity of either Bernier or of the bishops; and in spite of Theiner's clever attempt yet again to save Bernier's honour, D'Haussonville, even if he be wrong in some of his premises, is no doubt right when he attaches greater credence to the eight bishops than to the shrewd Bernier.¹ It is most difficult to understand how the Bishop of Vannes, who was considered a saint, could acquiesce in such an untruth.²

However this may be, Bernier's account of the meeting with the eight who had taken the oath helped to remove the last difficulties on the part of Rome. On 3rd April 1802 Bernier reported to Consalvi that the Concordat had been passed in the *Conseil d'Etat* on the previous day "without discussion." On the following Monday, 5th April, it was to be laid before the Legislative Assembly "not to be approved or to be rejected, but to be published as the law of the Republic." No difficulty was

¹ Theiner I, 393f. ; and D'Haussonville I, 190.

² Cp. Pasquier's estimate of him in the *Mémoires du chancelier Pasquier*, 117.

to be expected from that quarter. "It is the first work of the Assembly," Bernier adds, "and it will do it well. Lucien Bonaparte, who is appointed tribune, is preparing to support it in a speech."¹ It was to Portalis, however, that the duty of removing the last opposition in the Legislative Assembly was entrusted. He did so in a brilliant speech, so far as its form is concerned. First he pointed out the necessity of religion, which is really founded upon the necessity of having a scheme of morality. But a scheme of morality without dogmas would be *une justice sans tribunaux*. The multitude cannot be satisfied with proofs. It must have commandments—religion and not merely philosophy. The positive religions have this advantage, that they possess ceremonies. An abstract religion can never be a popular religion, and atheism is more dangerous to the State than superstition. But could not a new religion be formed? No, it is impossible. It is their antiquity which gives splendour to religions; men must believe that they are the work of God. Everything is lost, as soon as people catch a glimpse of the hands of man. Why then not go on with Christianity? Can the religion of Descartes, Newton, Pascal, Bossuet, and Fénelon be opposed to enlightenment and good morals? Christianity, no doubt, has certain dogmas of its own; but "they fill up the space which reason leaves empty, and which imagination would be sure to fill up in a worse manner." Furthermore, the State must aid religion in order to have some control of it. The Concordat, now concluded, must therefore be considered very successful, from the point of view of the State, particularly because of the "organic articles" which were added to it.²

Such a speech was needed when Bonaparte "erected the altars" in France. The "organic articles" to which Portalis alludes, were certain regulations which the French government had made with regard to the carrying out of the Concordat.³ They were drawn up without the knowledge of the Pope, and gave him occasion afterwards to make the strongest remonstrances; for they actually made the Church the slave of

¹ Bernier's letter in Theiner I, 397f.

² Portalis: *Discours prononcé dans la séance du Corps Législatif du 15 germinal (5th April) an X* (Paris an X).

³ They are printed in Ollivier, 115f., and in the appendix to Portalis: *Discours*.

the State. No Bull, no brief, or any other missive from the Pope, so those articles enact, may be published or printed without the permission of the government. Legates and nuncios must obtain authority from the French government to work in France. Not even ecumenical Councils can obtain validity in France, unless they are first examined and ratified by the government, and no ecclesiastical synod may be called together there without its permission. All services of the Church must be given without remuneration, with the exception of those for which the government has fixed the allowance. In all matters the *Conseil d'Etat* may be appealed to as a kind of final Court. There are no longer any legal exemptions for the clergy. Archbishops and bishops may add to their names "Citizen" or "Monsieur"; all other titles are abolished. If an archbishop refuses to consecrate his suffragans, the senior bishop may do it instead of him. No one may be made a bishop before thirty years of age, and only if he be a Frenchman born. The bishops may not leave their dioceses without permission of the First Consul. All the teachers in the seminaries must sign the Gallican declarations of 1682, and promise to communicate to their pupils the teaching embodied in them. No foreigner may be made a priest in France without special permission. There must be one catechism and one liturgy for the whole of France, and no festival except Sunday can be celebrated without special permission of the government. All ministers of the Church must wear French dress, and be clothed in black; the bishops, however, have permission to wear a cross and purple stockings. No religious ceremony must take place outside the churches in regions where there are several forms of belief. The church ceremony of marriage may only be performed when the couple has first contracted civil marriage. The archbishops are to have 15,000 francs a year, the bishops 10,000 francs, and the priests 1,500 or 1,000, besides parsonage and garden.¹

In spite of these "organic laws," which were to restore the Gallican liberties to the Church of France, the Legislative Assembly did not relish swallowing the bitter pill, which the Concordat was to them. On the same day that Portalis

¹ The position of the Reformed and Lutheran Churches is treated in an appendix. Ollivier, 127f.

delivered his speech, a deputation from the Assembly had an audience of Bonaparte. The spokesman made a speech in which he dwelt upon the peace of Amiens, which was now finally concluded, but he did not by a single syllable allude to the Concordat. It was a demonstration, the object of which was clear enough; but Bonaparte was not slow in answering. After thanking them he spoke as follows: "The session of the Legislative Assembly opens with the most important work that can engage the attention of a popular assembly. The whole French nation is desirous of seeing an end of religious strife, and a settlement of the form of public worship. You must, like the nation itself, be unanimous about the result of your deliberations. The French nation will hear with the greatest satisfaction that it has not a single legislator who has not voted for the peace of conscience, and the peace of family life, which is more important for the welfare of the people than the peace upon which you have just now congratulated the government."¹ It was a speech, which, in point of clearness, left nothing to be desired; and two days after, the Legislative Assembly passed the Bill by 228 votes to 21. On the same day the tribunate passed it by 78 to 9. The mob of Paris and the zealous revolutionaries revenged themselves by hooting a play, which one of the tribunes, who had spoken in favour of the Concordat, produced just at the same time in the Théâtre Français;² and the generals and the soldiers were astonished at hearing "the little corporal" speaking as if he were delivering a sermon.

On Friday, 9th April, Caprara was officially received at the Tuileries as Legate of the Holy See. He had requested that a man on horseback should carry a cross of gold in front of him, as old custom demanded when legates went to Court; but the authorities did not yet dare to present such a spectacle to the inhabitants of Paris. The cross was placed in one of the closed carriages, which preceded that of the Cardinal Legate. The First Consul received him at the head of a splendid assemblage, and listened graciously to his speech. He then took the oath. Bonaparte on the previous day had promulgated a decree, which acknowledged Caprara's function as Legate, as soon as, "accord-

¹ *Correspondance de Napoléon I.* VII, 546.

² De Pressensé, 519.

ing to the usual formula," he had promised to conform to the laws of the State and "the liberties of the Gallican Church." This expression was at the time undoubtedly understood by most of the outside world, as though the Legate was to acknowledge the four propositions of 1682; but such was not the case. The oath was only a general promise of obedience.¹ After the taking of the oath, Bonaparte expressed his appreciation of the Legate's person, and also the hope that the result of his mission would be "hailed with joy by all enlightened philosophers and true philanthropists."² On the following Sunday, which was Palm Sunday, four new prelates were canonically instituted, amongst them Cambacérès as Archbishop of Rouen, and Bernier as Bishop of Orléans. Each of the new bishops received a gift of money, a cross, a pastoral staff, and a mitre. The ceremony took place in the church of Nôtre Dame, which, until then, had been under the charge of those who had taken the oath. The unusual spectacle attracted a great multitude of people. The church, says Thiers, was full of a numerous band of Christians, who had been sighing over the unhappy state of religion, and who, without belonging to any party, accepted that day with gratitude the First Consul's gift to them.

On Easter Even, Bonaparte issued a proclamation, in which he invited the French to take part in the next day's festival, the publication of the Concordat. "Frenchmen!" says the proclamation, "in the midst of a revolution which was inspired by patriotism, there suddenly arose religious dissensions, which have become a scourge to your families, an incitement to party strife, and the cause of hope to our enemies. A foolish policy attempted to stifle these dissensions under the fragments of the altars, under the ruins of religion itself. At its bidding the pious festivals ceased, at which citizens called each other by the tender name of brother, and acknowledged each other as fellow-men under the hand of that God who made them; the dying who was alone with his pain no longer heard the voice of comfort that calls Christians to a better life; God Himself seemed to have been banished out of Nature. . . . It was to the Pope that the example of centuries, and reason, bade us go to make

¹ "Item servaturum statuta et consuetudines Reipublicæ et nunquam jurisdictioni ac juribus gubernii derogaturum." Among the documents in Theiner II, 154.

² *Correspondance de Napoléon I.* VII, 549.

peace between divided opinions, and to reconcile estranged hearts." Then the clergy are addressed: "Ministers of the religion of peace! Let the deepest oblivion hide your strifes, your misfortunes, and your faults. . . . Let the citizens learn from you that the God of peace is also the God of armies, and that He fights against those who wish to forbid France to be independent and free."¹

At last that Easter Day came, 18th April 1802, which at one and the same time was to be marked by the publication of the peace of Amiens and of the Concordat. Whilst the First Consul in the morning hours exchanged the documents relating to the peace of Amiens with the ambassadors of the foreign powers, a crowd, partly civil, partly military, paraded the streets to publish the Concordat. At eleven o'clock Caprara went to the church of Nôtre Dame followed by archbishops and bishops in full canonicals, and on that day the golden cross was carried before the Legate. Louis XV.'s gilded chariots and state carriages drove to the church, full of ladies in brilliant costumes, and on Madame Bonaparte's carriage were seen, for the first time, footmen in green livery with gold lace, which came afterwards to be the colours of the Napoleons. The First Consul went to church at the head of his faithful admirers. On the way, the splendid procession met Berthier and the generals, and, at a sign from Bonaparte, these joined his suite. It was a stratagem. To make the generals join in, Berthier had invited them to *déjeuner*, and after *déjeuner* requested them to go to the Tuileries to congratulate the First Consul. He took care that this request was accomplished at the moment when Bonaparte was on his way to church; and thus the generals were tricked into going to church likewise. They took part in the service, but they were, as Thiers says, more obedient than converted.

The former Archbishop of Aix, De Boisgelin, preached, and his sermon was a panegyric upon the General and the First Consul. The speaker drew a comparison between him, Pepin, and Charles the Great. The whole thing was a prelude to the coronation, and Bonaparte had specially chosen the Archbishop of Aix because he had preached in the cathedral of Reims when Louis XVI. was crowned. It seemed on that day as if France had only one ruler, and not three consuls.

¹ *Correspondance de Napoléon I.* VII, 558.

Bonaparte was also the only one for whom incense was literally burnt. When the priests asked in the morning whether the censer should not be swung for the other two consuls, Bonaparte answered: "No; the perfume will still be too strong for them." The presage of autocracy which was linked with the restoration of the Catholic religion evoked still more repugnance amongst the friends of liberty. Madame de Staël shut herself up in order to avoid seeing "the hateful show," and dissatisfaction smouldered among many of those nearest to Bonaparte. On returning from church the First Consul said to one of the generals: "Did not everything seem to be in the old order again to-day?" He received the answer: "Yes; except that two millions of Frenchmen have died for liberty, and cannot be restored to life."¹ But Pasquier, afterwards Chancellor, writes in his *Mémoires*: "Never did Bonaparte show himself greater than on that day. It was the most magnificent victory that could be gained over the Revolution. All the rest, without exception, were only results of this."² And Talleyrand saw in the Concordat the best proof of Napoleon's strength of character; for in concluding it he defied both the scorn of the army and the opposition of his brother consuls.³

After the conclusion of the Concordat, which was received with great joy, especially in the provinces, Bonaparte sent Pius VII. a letter in which he signed himself *de Votre Sainteté le très-dévoué fils*. But there were still two subjects of controversy between the First Consul and Rome—the Organic Articles, and the Legations, which Pius VII. constantly hoped to regain. Rome was greatly annoyed at the Organic Articles, but still more at the deceitful manner in which they were put forth. A paper was published in Paris, of which the title was *Concordat*, printed in capitals. In this the Organic Articles, were printed immediately after the articles of the Concordat and under the same date, so that it looked as if

¹ Mme. de Staël: *Considérations* II, 278. Her opinion of De Boisgelin, 276. De Boisgelin was afterwards the first who called Napoleon "legitimate," which word, according to Portalis, was the most important in a priest's mouth, *op. cit.* III, 360.

² *Mémoires du chancelier Pasquier* I, 160.

³ Talleyrand II, 36.

they formed part of the Concordat concluded with the Pope.¹ Consalvi passed the following judgment upon their contents: "They overthrew nearly the whole new edifice, which we had built up with so much pains. The regulations which the Concordat had made as to the liberty of the Church and of Divine Service, were again exposed to the decisions of Gallican jurisprudence, and the Church of France was in danger of being once more enslaved."

Consalvi's anxieties were fully shared by Pius VII. and his theologians, but nothing could be done. All representations, all prayers, all threats were in vain. The Organic Articles continued in force. And they were not quite without their advantages. They diminished the number of the parish priests, and increased the number of assistant clergy (*vicaires, desservants*), and since these could be removed simply at the bidding of the bishop,² a very large part of the clergy became altogether dependent upon the bishops. Bonaparte purposed by this regulation to extend his supremacy over the episcopate to the whole of the French clergy, but the dependence of the clergy upon the bishops in reality opened to Rome a sure prospect of ruling the French priesthood. This regulation in the Organic Articles contributed not a little to making Ultramontanism victorious in France, after the Gallican leaven had been purged out of the French episcopate.

But it was not at all easy to carry into practice the regulations of the Concordat, and to reconcile in detail the Church of the Revolution with the Church of the Monarchy. The priests and bishops who had not taken the oath could not forget the past of those who had done so, and the latter often saw in the former traitors to the cause of France and of liberty. The exiled bishops in England, and some of those in Spain, Germany, and Poland sent pastoral letters to their old flocks in order to stir up resistance to the new administration. Bonaparte was furious with these rebels, and Talleyrand was ordered to take measures against them through diplomatic channels. Nevertheless, the happy relationship with Rome was not disturbed by this means, because the protesting bishops by their attitude acted as much against the bidding of the

¹ Consalvi I, 429f.

² Titre 2, art. 31: "Ils seront approuvés par l'évêque et révocables par lui."

Pope as against that of the First Consul. Yet even down to our own days, a small schismatic body has continued in several of the French departments, called the *petite église*, whose special feature is resistance to the Concordat. At first this "little church" had both bishops and priests; it now consists only of lay people, and more and more of them seem to reconcile themselves to Rome, except in the cases where they have gone to yet further extremes in their resistance to the Papacy.¹

In order to show Pius VII. his satisfaction with the Concordat, Bonaparte presented him with two ships, whose names were changed to *St Peter* and *St Paul*. The Pope went wild with joy, as Cacault² writes, and the Romans began little by little to forget that there had ever been a revolution in their own town, as well as in France. "The Pope's subjects," reports Cacault a little later, "weep with joy because they find the French such good Catholics, and they exult to see them taking their places as the Eldest Sons of the Church."³ Pius VII., for his part, supported Bonaparte so earnestly that he made five Frenchmen cardinals, amongst others Fesch, the half-brother of Lætitia Ramolino, and therefore half-uncle to the First Consul. On 27th March 1803 there was again an ecclesiastical *fête* in the Tuileries, at which Madame Lætitia experienced the uncommon pleasure of seeing her son present the Cardinal's hat to his uncle in just the same way as Louis XIV. had presented it to the great cardinals in the days of old.⁴ Nine months previously Pius VII. had given Bonaparte another sign of his goodwill by issuing a brief, in which he made a layman of Talleyrand, who had worked so faithfully for the conclusion of the Concordat. The former Bishop of Autun considered it a sign of perfect forgiveness on the part of Rome, when he heard that Pius VII. had said to Consalvi, *M. de Talleyrand! ah! ah! Que Dieu ait son âme, mais moi je l'aime beaucoup*.⁵

¹ J. E. B. Drochon: *La petite église* (Paris 1894), where also is found (385f.) a letter about them (of 19th July 1893) from Leo XIII. to the Bishop of Poitiers.

² Despatch in Theiner I, 550f.

³ Theiner I, 554f.

⁴ Lyonnet: *Le Cardinal Fesch* (Paris 1841) I, 186f. Ricard: *Le Cardinal Fesch* (Paris 1893), 94f.

⁵ Talleyrand I, 284.

At the same time as the Concordat was published, a young, as yet unknown, nobleman of Brittany, Chateaubriand by name, put forth a work, which under the title of *Le génie du Christianisme* praised the beauty of Christianity. The book was very highly spoken of in the *Moniteur*, but sharply criticised by the Freethinkers. The author wished to convert infidels into believers by showing that Christianity is neither absurd, nor coarse, nor petty, as people had been taught by Voltaire and the *Encyclopædia*, "that Tower-of-Babel of Science and Reason." He had himself attained to faith through tears, and he strove to move others to tears by casting the splendour of poetry upon the "beauties" of Faith and of Divine Service. The essay was far more a poetical than an apologetic work, and the author was richer in images than in ideas, just as he had penetrated further into the works of the great poets than into the Holy Scriptures.¹ But these poetic effusions had their effect. Many Frenchmen required to see the beauty of Christianity, before they could acknowledge its truth.

And as poetry was employed through Chateaubriand's work to glorify the Concordat, so also was art likewise. Wicar made a drawing, representing Pius VII. in the act of signing the Concordat, which Consalvi was holding out to him. On Cacault's suggestion that it might prove a means of "honour and profit" to give this drawing a further publicity, it was etched on copper, and 5,000 copies were struck off. In a cheaper edition the etching was distributed in all the parsonages, in order to proclaim the peace between Bonaparte and Rome.²

But could this peace last long? In June 1803, after being present at an ordination at Lyons, conducted by Cardinal Fesch, Chateaubriand writes the following words to a friend: "If an all-powerful man were to draw his hand back to-day, Philosophism would to-morrow execute the priests with the sword of Tolerance, and reopen on their behalf the philanthropic deserts of Guiana."³ On such weak foundations did the peace rest! There was still a possibility of new dangers to the Church,

¹ See more about it in F. Nielsen's *Det indre Liv* (Kjöbenhavn 1881) I, 92f.

² See the despatch of Cacault in Theiner I, 509 and 554f.

³ Lyonnet: *Le Cardinal Fesch* I, 253.

which Chateaubriand did not think of: the all-powerful man might not only draw his hand back, but might lay it upon the Church. Before this could happen, Pius VII. had to render him the greatest service that could be asked of a pope. He must cast the glory of legitimacy over the crown which the daring soldier had seized.

CHAPTER X

THE CORONATION OF THE EMPEROR

ITALY was the first country in which the great French Revolution found an echo ; it was also the first in which the religious reaction made its appearance.

In the latter half of 1801 an extraordinary assembly from the Cisalpine Republic gathered at Lyons to consider the future constitution of North Italy. The assembly unanimously elected Napoleon Bonaparte President of the Italian Republic, and at the same time passed certain laws respecting the Church, which gave the clergy a much more favourable position than they had hitherto enjoyed. And Bonaparte showed his attachment to the Church by setting the following words at the head of the new Cisalpine Constitution : "The Catholic Apostolic and Roman Religion is the religion of the State."

The First Consul wished the relation between State and Church in Italy to be arranged by a Concordat similar to the French one ; but the authorities in the Italian Republic were very unwilling to follow him in this. The Vice-President of the Republic, Francesco Melzi, was a determined enemy of the Church ; and the hostile spirit, which ruled in official circles at Milan, found expression in a decree of 23rd June 1802, which contravened the agreements of Lyons, and brought the Church into complete dependence upon the State.¹ But Bonaparte now took up the negotiations for a Concordat, and with a sure hand led them to a happy issue with the support of those who had brought about the French Concordat. He sent the Cisalpine officials a thundering letter, and by his threats against the Italians, and his complaisance towards the Pope, the matter was brought so far that the Italian

¹ The decree is printed in Theiner II, 19f.

Concordat was signed in Paris on 16th September 1803; and after being ratified by the Council of State at Milan, it became law on 2nd November of the same year.¹ But the Italian Concordat had a sequel, like that of the French one. Melzi published some further regulations of the same nature as the Organic Articles in France, and they gave the Pope fresh occasion for sorrow and complaint.

Meanwhile affairs in France developed with the usual celerity; on 18th May 1804, the First Consul was designated Emperor of the French. Directly Napoleon received the title of Emperor, it began to be said in Paris that he ought to be crowned by the Pope. The only question was, whether it should be done at Aix la Chapelle, the favourite city of Charlemagne, in Paris, or at Lyons. Bonaparte gladly agreed to the suggestion. It was his wish to found a western empire like that of Charles the Great; and although, as he often said afterwards, he considered himself called of God to be Emperor of Europe, he could not but wish the successor of St Peter to be present when the new Empire was solemnly inaugurated.² And just at that moment he had special reason to desire the strongest religious and moral support that the Pope could give; for the murder of the Duke of Enghien had laid a blood-guiltiness upon his head, which only the benediction of the Pope could remove.³

Cardinal Caprara immediately reported to Rome the suggestion of the Parisians, and, for his part, he thought that such a coronation could only be good for religion, the Church, and the State.⁴ On 9th May 1804 the Cardinal Legate dined with Madame Bonaparte at Saint Cloud. The newly-elected Emperor was present, and entered into confidential conversation with Caprara. "Everyone," he said to the Legate, "tells me how glorious it would be if my anointing and coronation were performed by the Pope's own hand, and it would also be of benefit to religion. It is not likely that any other power will protest against this proceeding. For the moment I shall

¹ The Italian Concordat is printed among the documents in Theiner II, 270f.

² I. von Döllinger: *Betrachtungen über die Frage der Kaiserkrönung*, in *Kleinere Schriften* (Stuttgart 1890), 128f.

³ Lanfrey: *Histoire de Napoléon I.* III, 209.

⁴ Despatch from Caprara in Theiner II, 64.

not directly approach the Pope on the subject, because I do not wish to expose myself to the risk of a refusal. Will you introduce the question? and when I receive your answer, I will take the necessary steps with regard to the Pope." On the following day, Caprara sent a report of this conversation to Rome. He said that Bonaparte had mentioned the example of Pepin, who was anointed by Pope Stephen II., and that he had "spoken with uncommon seriousness." It was Caprara's opinion that Pius VII., without regard to old age, health, or any other consideration, ought to come and fulfil the wish of the Emperor.¹ In a postscript he met the objection that Napoleon might go to Rome, as Charlemagne had done, by the plea that the Emperor could not leave the centre of the empire. He even used the somewhat material argument in support of his proposal, that the coming of the Pope would draw many to Paris, and the poor city was much exhausted by the war, and needed resources.²

But at Rome there was great hesitation in agreeing to Caprara's proposal. According to the decree of the Senate of 8th May, Napoleon was to promise to respect, and cause to be respected, "the laws with regard to the Concordat, and freedom of worship," a regulation which seemed to protect the Organic Articles and to injure the supposed right of the Catholic Church. Added to this, it might be dangerous at the moment to make common cause with the French empire. The French bishops in England had published statements, in which they took up the cause of the ancient monarchy, and attacked the Concordat which compelled the priests to swear allegiance to the new *régime* in France, and to pray for it; and from Warsaw Louis XVIII. issued a protest against everything that had been done since 1789. These circumstances required that Rome should be most cautious. But, on the other hand, it was evident that the fate of Rome and of the Papal States was in the hands of the new Emperor. If he were to send his troops against the city of St Peter, there was nothing else for Pius VII. to do than to leave as soon as possible for Sicily, trusting that the English fleet would protect him there.

The diplomatic negotiation thus entered upon extended over

¹ Compare the extract from the correspondence between Caprara and Consalvi, in D'Haussonville I, 508f.

² Theiner II, 66.

five months. Consalvi, in a letter of later date to Talleyrand, ascribes to his courage and labour the honour of having brought about the fulfilment of the Emperor's wish.¹ But he had great difficulties to surmount, especially because he had to deal with Napoleon's uncle, Cardinal Fesch, who, as the ambassador of France at Rome, pleaded, in the eyes of such a diplomatist as Consalvi, his nephew's cause with an inconvenient want of tact. Consalvi's main impression of these negotiations was that they were painful and tiresome,² and the store-keeper of the first Italian war sometimes appeared under the robes of Cardinal Fesch in the oddest ways. When, for example, Fesch, after an excited interview with Consalvi, was about to get into his carriage, and his footman asked where he would drive, he cried out ill-temperedly, "To the devil!" (*a casa del diavolo*). A score of persons of all classes overheard it, besides the ambassador of a foreign power, and the story went round Rome.³

In our days, newspaper correspondents would soon have found out the secret of the diplomatists at Paris and Rome, and the telegraph would have carried it round the world; but it was otherwise then. Only a very small circle at Paris was admitted into the thoughts of the new Emperor, and they kept their own counsel. At Rome they proceeded no less cautiously. The cardinals whose opinion was asked had the secret confided to them under the seal of confession, and it was confided only to one at a time, so that nobody knew how many people shared the secret. Cardinal Fesch sent the Emperor a memorandum in which he collected all the objections of the several cardinals.⁴ They did not agree in recognising the legitimacy of the Emperor's position. The Organic Articles, and the French occupation of the three Legations, which Caprara in vain tried to regain, not to mention Avignon and Venaissin, were serious hindrances, besides; for the popes had hitherto only crowned those emperors and kings who had been the support of the Church in temporal as well as other matters. As already mentioned, the oath

¹ See the letter in Artaud : *Histoire du Pape Pie VII.* II, 103.

² *Mémoires de Consalvi* II, 411.

³ Artaud : *Histoire du Pape Pie VII.* I, 495.

⁴ See his letter and memorandum in Theiner II, 89f.

which the Emperor was to take could not fail to be an embarrassment to the Roman Church; and what would the Bourbon family¹ and the Austrian Emperor say to such proceedings? Would the Pope's journey awaken the jealousy of other courts, and make them believe that he preferred France to the rest of Christendom? While the Pope was in Paris, business with other powers would be interrupted, and the whole ecclesiastical machinery would come to a standstill. And when the Pope got to Paris, he might witness many a profanation of holy things. He might meet rebellious bishops, renegade priests, and Madame de Talleyrand,² and no one could be certain that the respect that was due to him would be shown. The journey of Pius VI. to Vienna had been very perilous, but the journey to Paris would be worse; for it was a nobler object to endeavour to lead a prince back from his errors than to crown an emperor. And what consequences might not this journey entail? All princes might in future demand that the Pope should come and crown them.

These and several other objections were brought forward by the cardinals, and they could not be removed in a day. But Cardinal Fesch was always sanguine, and his hopefulness infected the Court of Paris. On 20th June the Cardinal Legate was again at Saint Cloud. The Empress Josephine went to him and said: "Well, are we to have the Pope at Paris to crown my husband, the Emperor?" Caprara was embarrassed, but the Empress continued: "I know quite well that it is all arranged. But your silence deserves all respect; I cannot but approve your Eminence's silence." The Cardinal Legate then remarked that it was not at all so certain that the Pope would come, as the Empress believed. As he could not see the Emperor that evening, he drove to Talleyrand, who received the Legate with the exclamation: "Matters are at last settled! The Pope is coming to crown the Emperor!" To him also the Cardinal Legate was obliged to express his doubts as to

¹ Louis XVIII.'s anger at the Concordat and its results can be seen in Maury II, 251f.

² According to Artaud I, 467, the Pope especially stipulated that Madame de Talleyrand should not be presented to him, because, in spite of his brief, he would not acknowledge the marriage which the former Bishop of Autun had contracted.

whether the certainty with which the Pope's coming was expected in court circles was really justified.¹

A few days later, Caprara sent a despatch to Talleyrand which set forth all the difficulties connected with the Pope's journey, and the requirements that must be met if he were to come.² Rome desired that the anointing and crowning should not be alleged as the sole object of the journey; it should be understood that the Emperor wished to confer with the Pope on the ecclesiastical situation in France at large. The Emperor must also announce that it was impossible for him to leave his capital at the very beginning of his reign. The invitation must finally be brought, not by an ordinary courier, but by an embassy, consisting of two French bishops. The oath should be altered so that the scruples of Rome might be removed; and in particular the doubtful expression, "the laws relating to the Concordat," which might imply the Organic Articles, must be altered. The ceremony itself should follow the Roman ritual for the anointing and crowning of kings; and the constitutional oath, which is not mentioned in the ritual, must be kept separate from the ecclesiastical function. It followed as a matter of course that the Pope would forget the behaviour of the priests and bishops who had taken the oath, but had recanted; but he would not see the contumacious bishops who first condemned the Civil Constitution, and afterwards denied having done so. He would come towards the close of the year, so that the coronation might take place on Christmas Day, as a parallel to the coronation of Charles the Great;³ and he would proceed by short stages, so as to give the faithful everywhere a share in his blessing. But he would make his stay at Paris as short as possible.

The hesitations and requirements of Pius VII. gave the French government matter for many deliberations, and when it was rumoured that a coronation by the Pope's own hand was in view, the Republicans and the Freethinkers began again to move. In reply to them the Pope's coming was defended

¹ Caprara's report to Consalvi in D'Haussonville I, 525.

² Despatch in Theiner II, 109f.

³ "Also Rom selbst ermunterte den Imperator sich als den Karl des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts zu betrachten; den Papst selber liess man verheissen, dass er das an Napoleon thun wolle, was Leo III. an Karl gethan hatte!"—Döllinger, 137.

as the best means of casting splendour upon the approaching solemnity.¹ Who was there that better understood the arrangement of magnificent pageants than the Roman Church; and was there ever likely to be an occasion when a pageant would make a greater impression than when the Pope was present at it himself? Such considerations, however, did not weigh much with the atheistic generals and senators. The *Conseil d'Etat*, which had received the Concordat in silence, strongly opposed the idea of a coronation by the Pope, and even the more moderate members were scandalised by this attempt to revive the ways of the Middle Ages. Napoleon fought valiantly for his design, pointing out that a pope in the nineteenth century could not possibly enforce the claims of Gregory VII. or Innocent III., and he concluded with a consideration which once again reduced the *Conseil* to obedient silence. "Gentlemen," he said, "you discuss this question at the Tuileries and in Paris. Suppose you were discussing it in London, in the British Cabinet; suppose you were, to put it briefly, the ministers of the King of England, and you heard that the Pope was crossing the Alps to anoint the Emperor of the French, would you consider it as a triumph for England or for France?"²

On 18th July Talleyrand was at last able to send to Pius VII. the answer of the French government to his requirements.³ All the Pope's anxieties about the tone of feeling in France are dismissed. It is further remarked, that it could not reasonably be expected that affairs in France after such a revolution should at once be free from all defects. Napoleon's great and good acts, it was further remarked, were already so numerous, that it might be said that he had done more for the Pope than any other monarch had ever done in so short a time. "The reopening of the temples, the setting up again of the altars, the ordering of Divine Service anew, the organisation of the clergy, the grants to the cathedral chapters, the foundation of clerical seminaries, the guarantee given to the Pope for the retention of his States, the restitution of Pesaro, Fort Saint Léon, and Urbino, the Italian Concordat, the support that was given to the conclusion of a German

¹ Döllinger, 128.

² Thiers: *Histoire du Consulat et de l'Empire* V, 225.

³ Theiner II, 127f.

Concordat, the reopening of the missions, the protection of the Oriental Catholics against the Turks—did not all these things constitute a rare chain of benefits to the Church?" As to the oath, Talleyrand explained that the expression, "laws relating to the Concordat," only meant the Concordat itself, and not the Organic Articles. Liberty of worship was liberty for individuals to follow their conviction, and should be understood in the same way as the liberty granted to the Lutherans by Charles V. in Germany, and yet he was crowned by Clement VII. As France had formerly seen Pius VI. go to Vienna without feeling any jealousy, so might the other powers now without jealousy see Pius VII. go to Paris. There was no reason to fear the consequences, for an empire like the French Empire could only be founded *avec éclat*, and it was no every-day occurrence. In conclusion, it was said that the Emperor had the greatest respect for the sacred customs of the Church, so that, as a matter of course, the ancient ritual of the Church should be followed, and the oath should be kept separate from it. But, on the other hand, the Emperor would rather not wait until Christmas; it was his wish that the coronation should take place on the 18th of Brumaire.

This answer was bound to satisfy Rome, and it was accompanied by clear proofs of the goodwill of the Emperor. On 15th July a great distribution of the order of the *légion d'honneur* took place, and on that occasion the Emperor took off the grand cross which he himself wore, and sent it by Talleyrand to Caprara. Then he said to him: "I flatter myself that you will accept it. It is a pleasure to me to be able to confer it upon you with the assurance that you are the first foreigner who has received this distinction."¹ But it always seemed as if negotiations between Rome and Paris were to encounter incessant hindrances, and a new and serious hindrance arose just when everything seemed on the point of being arranged. Evidently as a concession to the revolutionary party, Napoleon conceived the idea of dis severing the anointing from the crowning. The first was to be done by Pius VII. in the church of Notre Dame, the second by a French cardinal (and therefore an imperial subject), in the church of the Invalides, just as the Archbishop of Reims in olden days had crowned the French

¹ Theiner II, 135; and D'Haussonville I, 528.

kings. This plan met with determined opposition at Rome. The crowning was in the eyes of the people more important than the anointing. It was just the proud thought that the Pope, after such serious defeats, in such a godless age, could yet bestow royal crowns, that attracted Pius VII. to Paris. For even if the higher classes saw the coronation in another light, the mass of the people would look upon it as a repetition of the medieval coronations, so full of honour for the Papacy. Napoleon saw at once that he must give way to the opposition of the Pope. But as in the Organic Articles he had found a way of escape from those parts of the Concordat that were disagreeable to him, so he had devised a way of escape from being crowned by the Pope's hand.

As the clergy had not yet sufficiently regained its old prestige for a mission of such importance to be entrusted to a minister of the Church,¹ the Emperor sent the invitation to Rome by his old comrade-in-arms, General Caffarelli, an enthusiastic friend of the Concordat. It was worded as follows: "Holy Father! The happy effect which the restoration of the Christian religion has had on the morals and character of my people prompts me to ask your Holiness to give me a new proof of the interest you feel in my welfare and that of this great nation, at one of the most important epochs known to the history of the world. I pray you to come and give in fullest measure a religious character to the ceremony of anointing and crowning the first Emperor of the French. This event will inaugurate a new era if it is performed by your Holiness in person. It will call down upon us and upon our people blessings from the God whose laws govern empires and families according to His will."² The Pope received Caffarelli very graciously, and Napoleon was at last near his object. Francis II. of Austria took an important part in bringing things to a successful issue. Pius VII. had been afraid of offending the Imperial house by crowning Napoleon as Emperor; but in the midst of the negotiations with him a message was received to the effect that Francis II., under the title of Francis I., Emperor of Austria, wished to make the imperial dignity hereditary in his house. This step was

¹ Theiner II, 218.

² *Correspondance de Napoléon I.* IX, 662.

a great relief to Pius VII., for thereby the crown of Charles the Great came to be strictly without an owner. On 6th October 1804 he announced officially to the papal nuncio that he meant to go to Paris, but "not merely to anoint and crown the Emperor." The object of his journey was to guard also the interests of religion, and he expected to have great results from it.¹

After a fortnight's rest at Castel Gandolfo, Pius VII. returned to Rome, and delivered there at a secret assembly of cardinals on 29th October an allocution, in which he explained all the negotiations with France and the object of his journey.² Napoleon hastened matters with all his might, that the coronation might at least take place on the Sunday after the 18th Brumaire (9th November). But this was impossible. The Pope was unable to leave Rome until 2nd November, after hearing Mass, and offering a long prayer in St Peter's.

He was accompanied on the journey by a small suite, consisting of six cardinals, certain prelates, court officials, and doctors. Consalvi remained at Rome, but Fesch, who was the Ambassador of France at Rome, accompanied the Pope. From the moment Pius VII. set foot on French soil the travelling expenses were defrayed by the French treasury. The French officials had received orders to arrange everything in the best possible manner. In spite of the low state of the papal treasury, Pius VII. had brought presents with him: for Napoleon two cameos, representing Achilles and Scipio; for Josephine some antique vases; and for the ladies-in-waiting costly rosaries. The journey lay through Florence and Alessandria to Turin, and from thence over the Alps to Lyons. Crowds of men and women gathered everywhere to receive the Pope's blessing, and he was fêted both by high and low. The youth of Lyons sent a deputation, which had an audience of the Pope, to assure him that they shared the faith of their fathers, and were happy to confess it with heart and fervour in a district so rich in martyrdoms. The old general who was in command at Lyons brought his son to the Pope, and said: "Holy Father! Jesus Christ blessed little

¹ Letter in Theiner II, 181.

² *Bullarium Romanum* XII, 244f.

children; bless my child, thou, who art His vicar on earth! I wish to educate him for the Church and the Emperor.”¹ At Lyons, however, the Pope had the sorrow of losing the aged Cardinal Borgia, the friend of all Danish visitors to Rome; he was taken ill during the festivities.

From Lyons the journey was continued to Fontainebleau, where Napoleon was to meet Pius VII., and here as everywhere the Pope travelled through “a people on their knees.”² On Sunday, 25th November, he arrived at Fontainebleau. Napoleon had destined the day to hunting, in order that he might avoid a solemn reception. The first meeting between them was to seem as if it were due to chance. Pius VII. therefore saw the new Charles the Great make his appearance in hunting costume, surrounded by Mamelukes and a great pack of hounds. The two sovereigns embraced each other, and got into the same carriage, to drive to Fontainebleau in a procession headed, strangely enough, by Mamelukes. On the palace staircase the Pope was received by the Empress and the courtiers, and when he had rested for some hours, the Emperor and Empress paid him a visit.

After a three days' stay at Fontainebleau the entry into Paris took place, but in the evening; because Napoleon did not wish the Parisians to see that the Pope sat on his right hand in the carriage. A suite of rooms at the Tuileries was placed at the Pope's disposal, and, as a delicate attention, they were furnished in the same way as the apartments in the Quirinal, so that he might feel himself at home. On 30th November he sent a letter to the Queen of Etruria in which he expressed himself quite overpowered by the goodness of the Emperor.³ On the same day representatives of the Senate, the Legislative Assembly, the Tribune, and the *Conseil d'Etat* had audience of him. People were afraid lest the democratic and Voltairian Tribune should introduce a jarring note among the expressions of welcome, but nothing of the kind happened. The president, Fabre de l'Aude, recalled

¹ Lyonnet : *Le Cardinal Fesch* I, 345f.

² The angry Consalvi at Reims in 1812 (II, 413) describes the Pope's journey as follows : “In short, they made the Pope gallop to Paris, like a private chaplain who receives orders from his master to say Mass.”

³ Letter in Theiner II, 200.

the action of the Pope at Imola, and the improvements in the government of the Papal States which he had introduced, but passed lightly over the Concordat. At first the Parisians received Pius VII. with curiosity, but this was soon changed into affection. The Pope of sixty-two, in his white dress, with his dignified and benevolent-looking features, who understood so well how to comport himself in a situation so unusual for a Pope, soon became the darling of the Parisians. Every morning the square in front of the Flora pavilion at the Tuileries, in which he lived, was filled with great crowds, who fell upon their knees when he blessed them, and Napoleon began to be jealous of the growing popularity of the Pope.¹

December 2nd, the first Sunday in Advent, was fixed upon as the great day on which the Emperor and Empress were to be crowned. Pius VII. much wished to know in good time what the ceremonial was to be, but they put him off with all sorts of excuses, so that he first became acquainted with it when it appeared in the daily papers.² The day before the coronation, Josephine came to the Pope in the greatest agitation. She unburdened her mind to him, and told him that she was only civilly married to the Emperor.³ In 1796, amidst the disturbances of the Revolution, they had, before Barras, in the presence of a couple of witnesses, contracted a civil marriage, and two days after, the young general had departed alone for the army in Italy. Nobody suspected it. The Emperor had been so eager to have all the children of his generals christened and his relations married in church, that people thought he had himself been secretly married at the altar. Josephine had for a time been carried away by the revolutionary current, and had taken the matter lightly; many husbands and wives of her *entourage* had not received the blessing of the Church. But lately she had felt qualms of conscience. When the Concordat was concluded, she asked her husband to have their marriage blessed in a church; but Napoleon had opposed it, either to avoid scandal, or because

¹ *Mémoires de Mme. de Rémusat*, par Paul de Rémusat (Paris 1880) II, 65f., 84.

² *Aus Metternichs nachgelassenen Papieren* (Wien 1880) I, 1, 292.

³ H. Welschinger: *Le divorce de Napoléon* (Paris 1889), 13f. *Mémoires du Chancelier Pasquier* I, 367f. F. Masson: *Napoléon et les femmes* (Paris 1894), 22f. and 123f.

he already had thoughts of divorcing her. It is indeed certain that his brothers, often in a brutal way, attempted at this time to persuade him into a divorce.

After hearing Josephine's confession, the Pope refused to crown the Emperor and Empress¹ until the canonical marriage had taken place, but he allowed it to be performed privately. On 1st December, about four o'clock in the afternoon,² a little altar was erected with all secrecy in one of the Emperor's rooms, and Cardinal Fesch, by the authority of Pius VII., married the imperial couple without the presence of any witnesses.³ The wedding ceremony remained a great secret between the few concerned; only Fesch, Berthier, Duroc, and Talleyrand were to know what had happened. After the ceremony, Fesch went to the Pope. "Is the marriage accomplished?" asked Pius VII.; and when the Cardinal answered, "Yes," he proceeded: "Well, then, we will no longer refuse to crown the Empress." The old custom, that princes, when crowned, should communicate, Pius had purposely omitted to mention; his conscience forbade him to put any pressure upon the Emperor to partake of the Sacrament.

If we may believe the Prefect of the Palace, De Beausset, the painter Isabey had previously, by means of small wooden dolls, given the Court instruction in the coronation ceremonies, and this childish procedure had met with the approbation of Napoleon.⁴ A great part of the dresses and the arrangements was left to the decision of David, and everything was done on the most sumptuous scale.

The 2nd of December was a cold day, but the weather was beautiful, and the streets of Paris were thronged with people. The church of Nôtre Dame was decorated with gold embroidered velvet from the vaulting to the floor. On the right side of the altar a throne was erected for the Pope;

¹ According to Consalvi's statement to Metternich (*loc. cit.*) there had been no mention during the long negotiations of the coronation of Josephine. It was not mentioned until Pius was at Paris.

² Ricard: *Le Cardinal Fesch*, p. 120, even gives the time of the marriage as eleven in the evening.

³ Mme. de Rémusat says that Josephine with rapture confided to her husband that she had been married by Fesch "en présence des deux aides de camp." *Mémoires II*, 67.

⁴ Lanfrey III, 238.

at the foot of the altar stood two plain armchairs for Napoleon and Josephine. The main door of the church was closed, because an immense throne, with twenty-four steps leading up to it, was erected there, over against the altar. At nine in the morning, Pius VII. drove from the Tuileries to the Archbishop's palace, where he was attired in his papal robes. After a short rest there, he passed through one of the side doors into the church, attended by bishops, priests, and a detachment of the imperial guards. In front of him were carried the cross and the insignia of the papal dignity. At his coming all present rose to their feet, and an orchestra of 500 men played the melody set to the words of Christ, beginning: "Thou art Peter." After kneeling at the altar, Pius VII. ascended his throne, and the French bishops approached to do homage.

A whole hour the Emperor kept the assembly waiting, probably because the Master of the Ceremonies had made a faulty arrangement of the times for the different processions to start. Napoleon drove first to the Archbishop's palace, from which the crown, the sceptre, the sword, and the imperial mantle were fetched, and were carried by the generals in front of him into the church, and placed upon the altar. At his entry into the church, Napoleon was attired in an ermine cloak, and on his head he had a wreath of laurels, in which he put people in mind of the heads upon ancient coins.

He and Josephine at first took their seats in the chairs at the altar,¹ and after the *Veni Creator* had been sung, the Pope asked him if he would promise to keep the laws, maintain justice and peace, and render to the ministers of the Church the honour due to them. With his hand on the Gospel the Emperor took oath: "I promise it." After another prayer their Imperial Majesties went up to the altar, while the choir sang: "Zadok the priest and Nathan the prophet anointed Solomon king in Zion, and the people rejoiced and said, 'Let the King live for ever!'" Then the Pope anointed first the Emperor, and afterwards the Empress, on the forehead, the arms, and the hands. As soon as the anointing was over, the imperial couple returned to their

¹ Cp. the order of the ceremony in Theiner II (documents), 298f. Mme. de Rémusat: *Mémoires* II, 68f.

places, and the High Almoner of France dried the anointed places. After the anointing, the Pope blessed the crowns, the sword, the mantles, and the rings; and when the ring, the sword, the mantle, and the sceptre had been given to the Emperor, Pius VII. approached the altar again to take the crown and give it also to Napoleon; but Napoleon took the crown out of the Pope's hand and placed it on his own head. Then he took also the crown intended for Josephine and placed it on her head, after which they both walked up to the great throne, accompanied by the Emperor's brothers, who carried their trains.

When Napoleon and Josephine were seated on the throne, the Pope approached and blessed them, and after kissing the Emperor on the cheek, he turned towards the assemblage and cried: *Vivat imperator in æternum*. The assemblage took it up and shouted: "Long live the Emperor!" and the guns announced that the Emperor of the French had received the blessing of the Church.

As soon as the church ceremony was over, the Pope retired. But then came forward the presidents of the Senate, the *Conseil d'Etat*, the Legislative Assembly, and the Tribunate; and the Emperor, seated, and with his hand on the Gospel, took the oath, in which, amongst other things, he promised to "respect and protect equality before the laws, political and civil liberty, and the irrevocable sale of national estates"—terms which brought a breath of modern times into the mediæval surroundings. After taking the oath, the Emperor and his consort left the church under a canopy, carried by priests. Then once more the guns were heard, and the people crowded together in the streets through which the Emperor drove. But the revolutionary generals took no part in the popular rejoicing. They saw with annoyance a son of the Revolution trampling on its religious and political ideals, and they did not conceal their ill-will; the modern Emperor, in the midst of his triumph, heard, like those of old, Fescennine verses, as he left the church of Nôtre Dame in the grand procession.¹

¹ Mme. de Rémusat's friends and acquaintances also kept aloof, but amused themselves in her house, waiting to see her return in her new finery.—*Mémoires* II, 73.

But Pius VII. was not satisfied either. It was contrary to the agreement, that Napoleon should have placed the crown on his own head. In that way the essential similarity between the imperial coronation and the kingly coronations of the Middle Ages disappeared.

How long Napoleon had had in his mind the device which he carried into effect cannot be determined; but that it was not a momentary impulse which he followed is evident from the ceremonial, as reported by Theiner,¹ and from the final discussions between Napoleon and the Pope.² Pius VII. meanwhile was so exasperated at the conduct of Napoleon, that he made the request that, if the coronation was mentioned in the *Moniteur*, the description should follow the ceremonial as originally arranged, according to which the Pope was to place the crown upon the Emperor's head. To this Napoleon would not agree; but on the other hand he did not wish to give the Pope any opportunity of making protests. He therefore took this course: he forbade the official paper to give any account of the coronation. Whilst all the French papers were full of descriptions of the splendid solemnity, the *Moniteur* observed absolute silence, although in the issue of 3rd December it had promised to give the detailed description "which our readers expect."³

The accounts of the coronation in Nôtre Dame astonished Europe, and filled all the friends of legitimist principles with resentment. From St Petersburg Joseph de Maistre wrote: "I wish, from the bottom of my heart, that the poor Pope would proceed to St Domingo to anoint Dessalines. When a man of the Pope's dignity and importance forgets both to such a degree, one cannot but wish that he would go so far in self-degradation as to become a mere puppet of no consequence."⁴ De Maistre even considers that the abominable crimes of Alexander Borgia were less dangerous than the disgraceful fall of his weak successor.

It took a long time before people at Rome received any

¹ Theiner II (documents), 303f. There we read: "Prière pour la tradition des anneaux, de l'épée" etc., but "Prière pendant que l'empereur prend la couronne."

² Cp. p. 268.

³ Artaud I, 520.

⁴ *Correspondance de M. le Comte de Maistre* I, 138. Quoted in D'Haussonville I, 352f.

news of the Pope, and Consalvi was filled with anxious forebodings. In the evening of 18th December he was informed that a balloon had descended by the lake of Bracciano, thirty-five miles from Rome. A slip of paper, attached to the balloon, announced that the owner was Garnerin, the privileged aeronaut of the Russian Emperor, and that the balloon had been sent up from Paris on the 25th of Frimaire (16th December) during a banquet which the city of Paris gave in honour of "His Majesty the Emperor Napoleon." In this way the first announcement of the coronation reached Rome; but many disbelieved it. The Duchess of Cumberland laid a wager with the French secretary of legation, Artaud, that either the whole story about the balloon was an invention, or that it was sent up by the English; for at that time the English were seen everywhere. But Consalvi and the other cardinals, who had been privy to the negotiations, breathed more freely.¹

As soon as Napoleon was anointed and crowned, his interest in the Pope at once diminished. He still showed great goodwill towards the Church and the clergy, and the greatest attention possible was bestowed upon the Pope. When Pius VII. visited the imperial printing press, a book was presented to him, which contained the Lord's Prayer in nearly a hundred languages, and another book was under preparation which glorified in verse his stay at Paris in almost all the tongues of the world; Silvestre de Sacy, with Hariri for his model, composed the Arabic verses in the collection. The *Moniteur* every day gave long descriptions of the visits paid by the Pope, and it seemed as if everything had gone well. On few occasions only did the successor of St Peter observe any ill-feeling. Once when he was blessing a crowd he noticed a man going away in order to avoid the blessing, but with happy presence of mind the Pope cried out to him: "Do not run away, Sir; the blessing of an old man never did any harm," and the saying went round Paris.²

In spite of goodwill on the part of Napoleon and the Parisians, Pius VII. longed to go home, but Napoleon did all he could to keep him. It was evident that it was the Emperor's intention, if possible, to induce the Pope to remain

¹ Artaud I, 522f. Theiner II, 221.

² Thiers: *Histoire du Consulat et de l'Empire* V, 270.

in France. One day a high officer—Pius VII. would never reveal his name—proposed to him that he should take up his abode at Avignon and establish a Papal palace in the Archbishop's residence at Paris: a privileged quarter of the city should then be formed, in which the ambassadors to the Pope should live. It is evident from this that Napoleon—for that he was the moving spirit is beyond doubt—had advanced so far in his plans for a State Church, that the Pope henceforth was to sink down to the level of an imperial chaplain.¹ Pius answered the officer that he would never willingly acquiesce in such a plan. If they were to use force, they would only have at Paris "a poor monk called Barnabas Chiaramonti." Before he left Rome he had made arrangements to meet such an emergency, so that a new pope would immediately be elected.

The people of Rome wished much to have the Pope back. On the night between the last day of January and the first of February, their city was overtaken by a great calamity. The Tiber had overflowed its banks, and had inundated a part of the city with such rapidity that the inhabitants had to save themselves by escaping to the house-tops, where they stood and cried: *Barcarolo, a noi! pietà! pane!* Consalvi himself arrived on the scene, got a boat launched, and in his cardinal's dress went from roof to roof with food for the unfortunate people. Artaud, who was himself an eye-witness of this action, relates how the example of the Cardinal had a striking effect upon other leading men of Rome.²

The news of this disaster made Pius long to return to Rome; but before he left he formulated his claims to the Emperor.³ He asked for the abolition of several abuses, and of those laws which were contrary to the dogmas of the Church. This was the case with the regulations of the *Code Napoléon* about divorce, and with several of the Organic Articles, especially the acknowledgment of the Gallican propositions. He demanded that the bishops should have their

¹ Artaud II, 44f. Theiner II, 248f. endeavours without sufficient reason to consign this proposal to the region of fables. The information, gained from the *Memoirs* of Metternich and Lebzeltern, about the negotiations at Savona (see below), render Artaud's story still more credible.

² *Histoire du Pape Pie VII.* I, 531f.

³ Theiner II, 254f. In February or March 1805.

old right of watching over the morals and conduct of their priests, and that the old laws about the observance of Sundays and holy days should again be put in force. Married priests should be prohibited from teaching; the monastic orders should be introduced again, or at least be tolerated. And finally, the Catholic religion must be declared to be the dominant religion in France. This letter was accompanied by another, in which the Pope touched upon the loss of his provinces. In accordance with the prompting of his conscience, and trusting to the Emperor's sense of justice, he pointed out that if he had to bear the heavy expenses connected with the Papacy he could not do without the territories which the French had taken from him. "It would, moreover, help to maintain equilibrium in Italy, to restore his lands to a prince who had no other weapons of defence than temporal weakness and spiritual dignity." The Emperor ought to imitate Charles the Great, who gave back to the Pope what he had conquered from the Lombards; and if there ever were a peace congress, the Papal chair must send a representative to it, not to interfere in the temporal negotiations of the sovereigns, but to see to the interests of the Papacy. The papal appeal ended with the expression of the wish that Pius VII. and Napoleon might obtain the same renown as Stephen IV. and Saint Louis.

This document Pius VII. delivered personally to Napoleon at Malmaison. The Emperor received it kindly, but he reserved his answer to the different points; and it was evident, as Cardinal Antonelli reports to Consalvi, that there was no chance whatever of regaining the lost provinces. The Pope was further confirmed in the hopelessness of his case when, on 15th March, Melzi, at the head of an embassy of Cisalpine officials, offered Napoleon the royal crown of Italy. There was no likelihood that the new King of Italy would begin his reign by restoring to the Pope some of his best provinces, especially considering how opposed to the Papacy feeling then was in the north of Italy.

Nevertheless the Pope received detailed and respectful answers to all his grievances. In the two replies produced by the joint study of Napoleon and Portalis, a line of action is indicated which at that time was the only possible and

right one, since it points to what could be realised under the then existing conditions. But such regard to existing conditions could not be reconciled with the claim of the Papacy to have absolute sovereignty. The claim to have the lost provinces restored was first answered. The Emperor declared that "he had always thought that it would be to the advantage of religion that the Pope at Rome should be looked up to, as not only the head of the Church, but also an independent scvereign." The Revolution, however, had destroyed the Pope's temporal power, and had damaged his spiritual power also, until the Emperor had at last succeeded, after many victories, in re-erecting the altars, and leading 30,000,000 Catholics back to their allegiance to St Peter's chair. But because the authority of religion had been maintained, resistance to it was by no means broken, and against such enemies as those of the Church power and riches were of no avail. Hatred and jealousy would rise against it, the very moment it obtained more temporal power and splendour. The amiable personality of Pius VII. secured greater deference to the Papal chair than the riches and power of former times. Nevertheless, the Emperor was highly disposed to secure for the Pope better temporal conditions, if God should permit the right moment to present itself. The constitution of the State, and his sacred oath, forbade him at that time to do what he would like; but if God granted him life, he hoped to be able "to improve and extend the Holy Father's territory. He would always consider it an honour and good fortune to be one of the strongest supports of the Papal chair."¹

Later on, Portalis composed a definite answer to the different points which the Pope had advanced in the first of his letters. With regard to the complaint that the French laws allow divorce, he says: "The civil law cannot forbid divorce in a country where religious parties are tolerated, which permit it." It would have shown but little wisdom suddenly to alter a legislation which fifteen years of revolution had naturalised in France. Besides, civil laws can only be relatively good; ideal demands must be adapted to the historical conditions of the nation. But in order not to disturb consciences, a circular of the time of the Consulate gave the priests permission to

¹ Theiner II, 265f.

refuse to marry divorced persons in church so long as their consorts were alive. When the Pope demanded the restoration of the old right of the bishops over their priests, the State was obliged, in the face of such a demand, to maintain its right to judge offences committed by priests, because priests are citizens. Canonical offences were quite another matter; such questions would immediately be referred by the State to the bishops. As to the Pope's wish for legislation respecting holy days, it was maintained that good example is more important than legislation. In the country there was more piety, and there the sanctity of Sunday would be more easily preserved; but in the towns it could not be enforced, because many would thereby suffer loss of income, and because many, as experience taught, by being forced to rest, would indulge in vices and crimes. The Pope's wish that married priests should not be employed as teachers would be respected, but his claim to have the Catholic religion declared to be the dominant one could not be complied with. "It is such in reality," says the reply, "because it is the religion of the Emperor, of the imperial family, and of the majority; a law that contained such a definition would be of no real good, but would only expose religion itself to great dangers. In the existing spiritual conditions such a law would reawaken old hatreds and create new enemies for Catholicism."

Nobody will deny that the Emperor and his councillors were right in their objections; even Augustin Theiner says: "Everybody must admit that unfortunate and deplorable circumstances did not allow Napoleon just then to go further."¹ But, on the other hand, it can easily be understood that Pius VII., who was always sanguine, had relied more on the friendliness of the Emperor than he ought to have done, and had believed him able to do more than he did. He returned home with disappointed hopes and anxieties over the possible consequences of the step he had taken; and this disappointment was so great that it cast dark shadows over what was otherwise bright in his journey. When Consalvi, eight years afterwards, comes to speak of the papal visit to Paris, "his memory and his pen refuse to tell of all the humiliations which the Pope had to suffer there."² These

¹ Theiner II, 280.

² *Mémoires* II, 413f.

words contain exaggeration no doubt, but it is certain that the friendship between the Emperor and the Pope had cooled a good deal when they parted. Napoleon was disappointed because the Pope would not remain in France. But the good relationship was not yet disturbed by any real breach. On Sunday, 24th March, Pius christened, with his own hand, Louis Napoleon, the son of Louis Bonaparte and Hortense Beauharnais. The Emperor stood godfather: Madame Lætitia was the child's god-mother. Nine cardinals and fifteen archbishops and bishops were present. To those outside, everything betokened the most cordial relations between the head of the State and the head of the Roman Church; but Pius was no longer comfortable in Paris, and he became more and more eager to go home.

The Emperor and the Pope travelled separately, although they travelled the same way, in order that people might have the opportunity of paying proper homage to them both; but they met afterwards at Turin. Napoleon had found his people in jubilation: Pius had again seen the people on their knees. From Turin, the Pope continued his journey through Parma, Modena, and Florence. There he met Scipione de' Ricci, who at last made his submission,¹ and on 16th May he re-entered his capital. The Cardinal of York went to meet him at the head of the cardinals, and there was joy everywhere. The Pope's first steps were directed to the altar of St Peter's; there he cast himself upon his knees to thank God, while a *Te Deum* resounded through the vaulting of the church. On 26th June he called together the College of Cardinals, and gave an account of his journey. In this he stated briefly that on 2nd December "the anointing and coronation of the Emperor and of his illustrious consort, our beloved daughter in Jesus Christ, Josephine, were carried out in the most solemn manner." He dwelt, besides, upon all the bright points of the journey; much had already been accomplished, and this was an earnest of further advantages to the Church in the future.

Before this communication was made to the College of Cardinals, Napoleon had been crowned at Milan on 26th May; and some weeks later he published the famous decree

¹ See above, p. 130.

relating to the ordering of the clergy, which demolished the last traces of the Revolution, and of Gallicanism in the Italian Church. This decree also called forth dissatisfaction at Rome, because it violated the Italian Concordat. According to the Concordat, the Emperor was not to take such measures without the co-operation of the Pope, but Napoleon forgot that completely, in his eagerness to have everything speedily arranged. When Rome complained of this forgetfulness, Napoleon was vexed, and informed Pius VII. "that he had several times told His Holiness before that the Roman Court was much too slow, and that it pursued a policy which might have been good enough in the past centuries, but was no longer suited to this."¹ The bitter pill was, however, wrapped up in so many kind expressions that Pius VII. was on the whole pleased with the letter, because it showed "the Emperor's attachment to religion and his opposition to the false philosophy of the century."²

It was not long, however, before Pius VII. came to feel that hand in hand with the Emperor's friendliness towards the Church, there went a great want of respect for the successor of St Peter. To induce Pius VII. to come to Paris, Napoleon had hinted that he would be prepared to go to Rome himself "with a good escort," if the Pope would not choose to come to him.³ That "good escort," moreover, he had close at hand, and he did not hesitate to use it, when he no longer had his own way.

¹ *Correspondance de Napoléon I.* XI, 120.

² The Pope's answer in Theiner II, 347f.

³ Döllinger: *Kleinere Schriften*, 157, following the indications of Dr Antommarchi.

CHAPTER XI

THE RUPTURE BETWEEN THE EMPEROR AND THE POPE

IN the year 1803 Napoleon's youngest brother, Jérôme, was in the United States as an officer in the squadron of Admiral Willaumez. During his stay at Baltimore he made the acquaintance of the daughter of the rich Protestant merchant Paterson ; and the Bishop of Baltimore married the young couple in spite of their different creeds, and in spite of the fact that the bridegroom, who was only nineteen years of age, could not produce the permission of his mother. Napoleon, who was then only First Consul, at first looked upon this union as an act of juvenile indiscretion ; but when Jérôme showed signs of wishing to take his wife to Europe, the Director of Police received orders, in case it happened, to send her to Amsterdam, and from thence back to America. Jérôme, meanwhile, was careful to land his wife at Lisbon, but when he heard there of his brother's order, he dared not disobey it. He sent his wife to Holland, and travelled himself to Milan to meet the Emperor. Napoleon soon got his brother to wish for a divorce, and his mother to lodge the complaint that her consent had not been obtained ; but it was not easy to get the Pope to annul the marriage. Cardinal Caprara placed his theological adviser, Caselli, at the disposal of the Emperor in order to find out all the reasons that might tell in favour of the Emperor's wishes ; but an agent of the United States pleaded the cause of the Paterson family at Rome. Pius VII., who had studied canon law all his life, took the greatest pains to discover a reason which might make it possible for him to gratify the Emperor ; and at last he believed that he had found such a reason in one of the decrees of the Council of Trent. But he soon had scruples. Had the

decree of the Council of Trent been published at Baltimore? Minute investigations were made in the archives of the Inquisition and the Propaganda to find an answer to this question, and the upshot was that the decree of the Council of Trent had not been published at Baltimore. Consequently, Pius VII., in the friendliest of terms, refused to sanction the divorce. Napoleon, quite unable to understand the anxious scruples of the Pope, found in the conduct of Rome only a ridiculous expression of spitefulness and ill-will, and he could not conceive how a pope should not be willing at once to declare the marriage of a Catholic with a Protestant null and void. That religion, then as always, was to Napoleon only a weapon for momentary use, was made plain at a later time, when he made Jérôme marry the Lutheran heiress of Würtemberg.¹

After this little disagreement the Pope began to discover, as did nearly all the sovereigns of Europe, that Napoleon was a tyrant, who could less and less put up with any hindrances in his way. But in spite of the strained relations between France and Rome, the other Powers continually upbraided him with showing special favour to France. They soon had occasion to see that the relation between the Pope and the Emperor was less warm than they thought. In October 1805 the French troops obtained permission to march through the Papal States on their way from Naples to the north of Italy; but the French general forthwith abused this permission to occupy the Papal city of Ancona. The Pope expressed to the Emperor his astonishment at this step, and threatened in the mildest terms to break off diplomatic relations if Ancona were not evacuated by the French.²

A sorrowful tone pervades the whole of the Pope's letter. He has paid every regard to France; he has been obliged to suffer for it at the hand of others, and what reward has he received? Napoleon was then outside Vienna (November 1805), and he was so much taken up with more important

¹ Prince Napoleon, Jérôme's son, in the *Revue des deux mondes* for 15th September 1867, tries to prove that the Pope afterwards acknowledged the dissolution of the first marriage by sanctioning the second. That the Prince, however, is not right in this matter is clearly apparent from Pius VII.'s careful expressions about the second marriage (D'Haussonville II, 389f.), and from Consalvi's words (*Mémoires* II, 463).

² D'Haussonville II, 59.

matters that two months elapsed before he found time to answer the Pope from Munich, in January 1806. He received the Pope's letter, he said, at a critical moment, but he answered it amidst surroundings of good fortune and of praise. His words from beginning to end sound like a rebuke to the Pope. He takes God to witness that he has done more for religion than all the reigning sovereigns put together, but Pius VII. has always been unreasonable and ungrateful.¹ In a letter to Fesch on the same day, Napoleon calls the Pope's letter "ridiculous and idiotic," the Pope's councillors "fools," and he threatens to recall Fesch and send a Protestant layman to Rome as Minister. He says bluntly that the Pope and his councillors, by their relations with the Russians and English, have "prostituted religion," and he hints that he might be tempted to reduce the Pope to be Bishop of Rome.²

This "reduction" appeared to him more and more desirable. The Papal States formed a disagreeable gap between the kingdoms of Naples and of Italy, and its capital was the seat of a clever diplomacy representing Powers which were nearly all hostile to France. Fouché, who even in Rome had many spies, reported to his Emperor that Nelson's victory at Trafalgar had created quite as much joy in Rome as the battle of Austerlitz. The same spies also reported, it is true, that the Quirinal remained neutral, but this Napoleon did not believe. He found it advisable, however, to prepare the way for the reduction by peaceful negotiation, and to that end he wrote, on 13th February 1806, a remarkable letter to the Pope.³

In this he advises the Pope to get rid of all difficulties by keeping aloof from those Powers which, from a religious point of view, are heretical and outside the Church, and, politically speaking, are so far distant from the Papal States that they are unable to defend him, and can do him nothing but harm. He further proposes a sort of alliance between France and Rome. "Our conditions," he says, "ought to be, that Your Holiness will pay the same regard to me in temporal matters that I pay to you in spiritual matters. . . . Your Holiness is sovereign in Rome, but I am the Roman Emperor. All my

¹ *Correspondance de Napoléon I.* XI, 642f.

² *Ibid.*, 643f.

³ *Ibid.*, XII, 477.

enemies ought to be yours." He reproaches Rome for its slowness and laziness, but hints that this reproach only concerns certain persons in the Pope's *entourage*, who "do not care for what is right, but, instead of labouring in these critical times to heal the hurt, only labour to make it worse." These words were aimed at Consalvi. Fesch, who could never hit it off with the papal Secretary of State,¹ continually slandered Consalvi to Napoleon, and the Emperor had discovered, during the negotiations for the Concordat, that Consalvi was one of the few Roman statesmen who had sufficient political insight and knowledge of European politics to prove dangerous. Therefore the Emperor's ill-will turned more and more against Consalvi. In the above-mentioned letter to Fesch Napoleon wrote: "Tell Consalvi, that if he loves his country, he must either leave the ministry or do what I require; and that I may be religious, but that I am not a sanctimonious person."

The Emperor's demand at this period was that the Pope should break off diplomatic connexions with all the enemies of France, expel their subjects from the Papal States, and close his harbours against them—in short, cast in his lot with the Emperor. It can easily be imagined that a statesman like Consalvi never could agree to such a project; for the moment that such a demand was satisfied, the Pope would have sunk into being nothing but a French courtier bishop. Nor did Napoleon make Rome more complaisant by emphasising the Roman character of his empire; for people were by no means blind to the great difference that there was between the Europe of Charles the Great and modern Europe. If he had pursued Napoleon's policy, Pius VII. would have surrendered his spiritual authority over more than half of Europe; and in view of the despotic character of the Emperor, it is very doubtful if he would by that means have gained any greater influence over the Church of France.

Consalvi, in the meantime, advised the Pope to place the matter before the cardinals, and this was done. Two meetings were held, in which thirty cardinals took part; but all of them, except the French cardinal, Bayane, were against Napoleon's proposal, "because the independence of the Holy See was so closely connected with the welfare of religion" (*troppo*

¹ Lyonnet I, 523. Ricard, 153.

strettamente connessa col bene della Religione.)¹ In an elaborate letter the Pope explained the reasons which led him to reject the Emperor's proposal. God is the God of peace; how, then, could His representative be expected to further strife? God offers peace both to them that are nigh, and to them that are afar off; therefore, the Pope must keep peace both with Catholics and with heretics. On this ground he must reject the Emperor's proposal, which would drag him into war with the Emperor's enemies. Regarding Napoleon's censure upon Rome for being slow, with special reference to affairs in Germany, Pius VII. rightly points out that affairs there were very complicated, and became more so day by day, especially after the congress of Regensburg. Napoleon's attempt to make himself Roman Emperor is dismissed with the remark that he is the Emperor of the French, but that he has no authority whatever over Rome. There is no emperor over Rome: it would mean the abolition of the Papal authority. There is a title of Roman Emperor, but it belongs to the Emperor at Vienna, and cannot at one and the same time be borne by two sovereigns. Pius VII. therefore feels himself constrained to reject Napoleon's theory that the Pope should acknowledge his authority in temporal matters, just as he acknowledges that of the Pope in spiritual matters; for the Pope's spiritual authority is of divine origin, and cannot be compared with any temporal authority. It is therefore unreasonable to demand that the enemies of a prince should be also the enemies of the Pope. Such a demand would be in conflict with the divine mission of the Papacy in the world.²

That this letter would not make Napoleon more favourably disposed is obvious; he believed that he clearly discerned in it the views of Consalvi. His hatred of the Papal Secretary increased in consequence, and it continually received fresh nourishment. When Joseph was appointed King of Naples, the event was announced to the Pope in very high-flown language; but a few days after, Consalvi reminded Fesch in a note, of "the very intimate connexion which had existed for several centuries between the Pope and Naples";³ or, in

¹ Consalvi II, 443.

² An extract from the letter will be found in D'Haussonville II, 127f.

³ D'Haussonville II, 173.

other words, that the Pope claimed sovereignty over both the Sicilies. This boldness filled up the measure. "What does this Papal Secretary mean? What spirit of levity has possessed him?" writes Napoleon to Caprara. "If this continues, I will have Consalvi removed from Rome, and make him responsible for what he intends, for he is evidently bribed by the English."¹

In order to show that his threats were seriously meant, Joseph had already, a week or two before, been ordered at once and in all secrecy to occupy Cività Vecchia, the seaport of Rome. Consalvi protested immediately against this occupation, and ordered the papal nuncios to inform the foreign governments that it was an act of violence, and not a consequence of any friendly agreement. But this did not stop Napoleon. Shortly afterwards the *Moniteur* announced that the Emperor had granted Benevento and Pontecorvo, the Pope's two *enclaves* in Naples, to Talleyrand and Bernadotte, and at the same time a layman and an enemy of the Church, Alquier, was sent to Rome as French ambassador in the place of Cardinal Fesch. By this the Pope perceived clearly that nothing less than his whole temporal power was at stake, and he therefore determined to take up a firm attitude towards Napoleon.

When Consalvi saw that the Pope's mind was made up, he considered that the moment was come to retire, although he was convinced that it would be of no use. He suggested to the Pope that he should choose another secretary, but for a long time the Pope was unwilling, lest it might seem to be a concession to Napoleon.² At last he gave in to the representations of Consalvi, and on 17th June 1806 chose Cardinal Casoni to be his successor. Casoni had spent some time at Avignon, and had afterwards been nuncio in Spain, and France had no reason to suspect him. It was a genuine sorrow to the Pope to lose Consalvi, and this sorrow was shared both by the citizens of Rome and by the foreign diplomatists.³ Everybody felt as if they were standing upon a volcano—Pius VII. no less than his subjects. When Cardinal Fesch had his farewell audience of Pius, he denied point-blank the Pope's right to use his spiritual authority in the present condition of things in France, and he

¹ *Correspondance de Napoléon I.* XII, 457f.

² Consalvi II, 481f.

³ *Ibid.*, II, 491f.

professed openly the opinion that General Councils were superior to the Pope. The master's want of consideration had infected the servants.

Napoleon proceeded further and further in the direction of his ideal "Caliphate," which, especially since the coronation, had become his favourite and constant subject of thought. D'Haussonville observes how Napoleon, after the coronation, put forward the old bishops, whilst formerly he had been particularly anxious to support those who had taken the oath.¹ At the same time he threw open commissions in the army to the old nobility, the Bar to the old Parliamentary families, and the offices of the Court to the men of the old *régime*. He himself explained why he did so: "Only the people of the old stock know how to serve (*servir*)." He wished his government to be regarded as a continuation of the government of Louis XIV., only with this difference—that he was infinitely greater than the great King, and consequently he ought to have the Church more completely in his power. After his return from Tilsit in 1807 he told the papal nuncio in Paris, in the presence of all the diplomatists, that he would not allow his subjects to go to Rome and pay homage to "a foreign prince" like the Pope, so long as the Pope would not lay all sovereignty aside, and, like St Peter, be content with the spiritual power.²

At the very moment when he was about to break with the Pope, he was to be seen taking more than usual pains, as he expresses it, "to speak the language of religion." He asks the bishops to render thanks to "the God of battles" for the splendid protection He has afforded to the arms of France, and the priests are ordered to pray "that our persecuted Catholic brethren in Ireland may obtain liberty of worship." At first his victorious bulletins were read in the churches; but this was afterwards forbidden, because it would be awkward if the Emperor were ever to suffer a defeat, and, besides, the pulpit would thereby gain too great an influence. Napoleon had great ideas of the importance of a sermon, and he followed the preachers with the greatest attention. "Let M. Robert, the priest at Bourges, know," he writes to Portalis, the Minister of Public Worship, "that I am displeased with him. On the 15th August he preached a very

¹ D'Haussonville II, 208f., 215.

² Metternich: *Nachgelassene Papiere* I, 1, 295f.

poor sermon.”¹ At first he confined priests with whom he was “displeased” in a monastery, afterwards they had to go to prison. Sainte Marguerite, Fenestrelle, and Ivree had their cells filled with clergymen.

But did not some of the French clergy deserve the scorn that lay at the bottom of divers of the Emperor’s remarks? There were many bishops and priests who fawned upon Napoleon, and flattered him in a most indecent manner, and there was no one who had the courage to stay him on the road of self-deification. At the suggestion of Portalis two new festivals were introduced, as compensation for the old ones which had been abolished in order that the people should not be drawn away from work. One of them, “St Napoleon’s Day,” was to be kept on 15th August, the birthday of Napoleon, and it was to be a day of thanksgiving for the good fortune of the empire; on the other hand, the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin, which had previously been associated with that day, was to be put out of mind. At a corresponding festival in the winter-time the Great Army and the Emperor’s coronation were to be glorified. In answer to the circular which ordered the introduction of these festivals, petitions were sent in from many quarters to be allowed to erect chapels to the saint who had been so fortunate as to give the great Emperor his name. The old returned emigrant, D’Osmond, Bishop of Nancy, invited the faithful to form associations named after the new fashionable saint; and the biographer of D’Osmond, the Abbé Guillaume, says in 1862, in flattery of the Second Empire: “At the sound of the magic name Napoleon, thought became animated, hearts grew warm, and the masses set themselves in movement, and worked for the honour and the welfare of the country.”²

There was, however, one drawback connected with the new saint: he was quite unknown. The Bollandists and the Roman Martyrology did not mention him, and D’Osmond could not find anything at all about St Napoleon in the libraries of Nancy. The zealous bishop wrote direct to Paris, but in spite of the city’s wealth of books all researches had the same poor result; no one anywhere knew anything of St Napoleon. At

¹ D’Haussonville II, 226.

² Quoted in D’Haussonville II, 232.

length Comparative Philology was drawn upon to help to dissipate the darkness that surrounded the new saint. It was discovered that a Greek of the name Neopolis or Neopolas had suffered martyrdom at Alexandria under Diocletian or Maximian. It was thought, therefore, that the name Neopolas, in accordance with the changes of sound in mediæval Latin, must gradually have passed into Napoleo, and so into the Italian Napoleone. Upon this deep philological hypothesis, the new saint made his entry into the French calendar. But it was no wonder that the Emperor, who lived and laboured amongst the French people, by degrees put the unknown saint into the shade, when the day of St Napoleon gathered together the festive crowds.

Ecclesiastical despots are wont to feel a certain uneasiness with regard to the individual differences which make their appearance along with the appropriation of things religious; and therefore they have commonly endeavoured to give the Church around them an appearance of uniformity. At that time several church papers were published in France, but they were all ordered to stop, because it was not easy to keep an eye on them. On the other hand, a *Journal des Curés* was to be published as a kind of official church organ.¹ The same striving after uniformity had already been expressed in the Organic Articles, where we read: "There shall be only one liturgy and one catechism in all the Catholic Churches of France."² Shortly after the conclusion of the Concordat, the preparation of a new catechism was taken in hand, but afterwards Napoleon thought it most profitable to take Bossuet's catechism as a basis. It was in harmony with his awakening sympathy for the old *régime*. In spite of warning from the Holy See, Cardinal Caprara had taken part in the preparation of the new catechism, and was afterwards rewarded for it with censures from Rome. The Imperial Catechism of 1806 was thus in the main the work of the Bishop of Meaux, but Bousset's composition was supplemented by certain additions "which should bind the people closer to the Emperor's august person," and "guide their submission towards the proper end." In order to understand such phrases as these we need

¹ D'Haussonville II, 229f.

² *Articles organiques*, titre 3, art. 39.

only look at the explanation of the Fourth (*i.e.*, the Fifth) Commandment.

In Bossuet's catechism we read, What does the Fourth Commandment teach us further?

Answer: To respect all in authority, priests, kings, magistrates and others.¹

These few words sufficed in 1686, but in 1806 this part of the catechism was considerably swelled. Napoleon would not be placed behind the priests and in a line with the magistrates, and Frenchmen since the Revolution would need a more thoroughgoing education in obedience to be of any avail. Therefore the corresponding part in the Imperial Catechism, which seems to be the work of the Emperor himself, reads thus:

Q.: What duties have Christians towards the princes who govern them, and what are our particular duties towards Napoleon I., our Emperor?

A.: Christians owe to their sovereigns, and we especially to Napoleon I., our Emperor, love, respect, obedience, faithfulness, military service, the taxes, which are imposed to preserve and defend the empire and his throne; we owe him, further, fervent prayers for his salvation, and for the spiritual and temporal welfare of the State.

Q.: Why do we owe all these duties towards the Emperor?

A.: First, because God, who creates kingdoms, and divides them after His will, has lavished upon our Emperor gifts both in peace and war, has placed him as ruler over us, and made him to be the minister of His power, and the image of Himself on earth. To honour and serve our Emperor is therefore to honour and serve God Himself. Secondly, because our Lord Jesus Christ Himself, both by His teaching and by His example, has taught us what we owe to our sovereign; He was born at the time when obedience was being paid to the commandment of Cæsar Augustus; He paid the prescribed tax; and at the same time that He bade men to render unto God the things that are God's, He bade them to render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's.

Q.: Are there not special circumstances which ought to bind us still closer to Napoleon I., our Emperor?

A.: Yes, for it is he whom God has raised up under

¹ D'Haussonville II, 246.

difficult circumstances to restore public worship and the holy religion of our fathers, and to be its guardian. He has restored and preserved public order by his deep and effectual wisdom ; he defends the State with his mighty arm ; he has become the Lord's anointed by his consecration at the hands of the Pope, the head of the whole Church.

Q.: What must we think of those who do not fulfil their duty towards our Emperor?

A.: According to St Paul the Apostle, they oppose what God has Himself ordained, and render themselves worthy of eternal damnation.

Q.: Shall we owe the same duties towards the legitimate successor of the Emperor as towards the Emperor himself?

A.: Yes, surely ; for we read in the Holy Scriptures that God, the Lord of heaven and earth, according to His will, not only gives kingdoms to a single person, but also to his family.

Q.: What are our duties towards our magistrates?

A.: We must honour, respect, and obey them, because our Emperor has entrusted to them his authority.

Q.: What is forbidden by the Fourth Commandment?

A.: It is forbidden to disobey our superiors, to do them harm, or to say anything evil of them.

According to this recipe obedience to the Emperor was in future to be hammered into the French children. When the Pope came to know of this catechism, he remonstrated immediately, because the Emperor in authorising it assumed a power which God had confided to the Church alone. It was to the apostles, and not to kings, that Christ had said, "Go ye and teach all nations!" But it was too late ; the Imperial Catechism continued to be the authorised manual of instruction in France until the fall of the empire.

New encroachments went hand in hand with the Emperor's surreptitious usurpation of the right to establish text-books, which in Catholic lands is reserved for the Pope alone.¹ Napoleon was not contented with having taken possession of the fortified places in the Papal States. He desired the moral

¹ For the following, cp., besides D'Haussonville's detailed account at the end of Vol. II. and in Vol. III., C. de Meaux: *Pie VII. et Napoléon*, in the *Revue des questions historiques* (Paris 1867) I, 2, 549f.

support of the Pope against his enemies ; and since Pius VII. was unwilling to give it, he determined to take the final step. On 10th January 1808 General Miollis was ordered to advance upon Rome with the greatest secrecy, and in such a way that it would appear as if he intended to effect a juncture with the troops in Naples. He was to take the city, and to repress the least attempt at rebellion very severely.¹

At the end of January 1808 the General marched at the head of his army from Florence. As soon as he came to the borders of the Papal States, he asked permission to proceed by way of Rome. He expressed the wish that he had wings with which to reach Naples through the air, but since there was no other road on land than that through Rome, he asked permission to use it.² The permission was granted, and nobody wondered at seeing, early in the morning of 2nd February 1808, a numerous French corps marching in through the Porta del Popolo. The army proceeded in order along the Via Babbuino, by the Piazza di Spagna, to the Porta S. Giovanni, with some guns in front, followed by the cavalry and infantry. As soon as they reached the great square in front of the Quirinal, where the Pope lived, a halt was made, and the guns were trained on the palace. It was Candlemas Day, and when the French soldiers marched in, the Pope and the cardinals were at service in the chapel of the Quirinal. They did not allow themselves to be in the least disturbed by the French, who beheld with wonder the Pope and the cardinals entering their carriages after the service as if nothing were happening. The Roman people could not take the matter so quietly, and for the first time in the memory of man the carnival week passed entirely unheeded.

Shortly after the French occupation of Rome, Cardinal Casoni was taken suddenly ill, and Doria Pamfili, who, on account of his short stature, was called *Breve Papæ*, succeeded him as Papal Secretary of State. His government, however, did not last long, for Napoleon gave vent to his hatred of the Sacred College in an order which commanded that all the cardinals who were not Papal subjects by birth, should

¹ *Correspondance de Napoléon I.* XVI, 279.

² A. von Rennenkampff: *Ueber Pius VII. und dessen Exkommunikation Napoleons* (St Petersburg 1813), 2f.

immediately be conveyed to their native regions, whether they would or not. In consequence of this order Doria was compelled to leave for Genoa, and Gabrielli became his successor. The Pope's patience was now at an end: "Alas, these concessions," he exclaimed, "what disasters have they not brought upon me!" and in his despair he took the decisive step of breaking off diplomatic relations with France. Caprara's plenipotentiary power was taken from him, and he was recalled. The Pope's *entourage* tried to dissuade him from so violent a measure, but he stood firmly by his plan; it almost seemed as if he felt a certain pride in daring to take such a fateful course alone. The foreign diplomatists were more or less indifferent to the fate of the Pope; there were other thrones which were tottering at the time.

On 16th June two officers entered the house of the Papal Secretary of State, Gabrielli, without being announced, and put him under arrest.¹ Then they sealed up his writing-desk, on which lay several important documents, and took him away from Rome. In the evening of the same day the Pope summoned Cardinal Pacca, and appointed him secretary. This cardinal had won his diplomatic spurs as nuncio at Cologne, but had afterwards been overshadowed by Consalvi, of whose secret enemies he was one. Pacca was an extreme absolutist both in Church and State, and had a more theological turn of mind than Consalvi. In conversation he was brilliant, and he possessed natural humour; but his horizon was narrow, and his view warped. The defiant position which he had been obliged to take at Cologne had been entirely after his own heart, and the situation which now awaited him as Papal Secretary did not differ much from the previous one. His experience at Cologne had taught him that it was best to proceed gently at the outset. Everything went quietly for a time—so quietly that the Pope began to be anxious: "My Lord Cardinal," he said one morning to Pacca, "people say in Rome that we have fallen asleep. We must show that we are awake, and send a strong note to the French general regarding these latest deeds of violence."²

But Pacca reserved his guns till the right moment. He

¹ Pacca: *Historische Denkwürdigkeiten* (Augsburg 1831) I, 21.

² Pacca I, 29.

had many conversations with General Miollis, in which he endeavoured to persuade the General to stop the acts of violence, but in vain. Bitter words were exchanged between them. Miollis said that he had orders to shoot and hang everybody who opposed the Emperor's commands within the Estates of the Church. Pacca, however, only became defiant: he was not frightened.¹

The right moment for energetic measures was not long delayed. The French had attempted to form a citizen guard in Rome, and many had been enrolled. But on 24th August 1808 a proclamation was found posted at the street corners of Rome, in which the Pope, as the "lawful sovereign" of the State, threatened those who enrolled themselves in the guard with the punishment of the Church.² Miollis, who recognised Pacca's style in the proclamation, determined to remove this Secretary as he had removed his predecessor. A few days later he sent a major to Pacca, to order his immediate departure for Benevento, his native town. The major was attended by a subaltern, who was to take care that the Secretary did not leave the house, and especially that he should have no communication with the Pope. Pacca, with the major's permission, wrote a note to the Pope, in which he told him the reason of his unwonted absence from the audience. A few moments afterwards the Pope entered, and told the officer that he was tired of all the indignities inflicted upon him. Thereupon he turned to Pacca and ordered him to follow him. The French officer, who did not understand Italian, asked Pacca very politely to translate the Pope's words. The Secretary did so. When Pacca had finished, the Pope said: "My Lord Cardinal, let us go." He then led Pacca away by the hand, and the disconcerted officer dared not resist. From that day Pacca occupied three rooms adjoining the Pope's apartments; both of them felt as if they were besieged, and expected a sudden attack every day.

The rumour of Napoleon's intention to usurp the Papal States and carry off the Pope revived at the Quirinal the idea of excommunicating the Emperor. It had already been proposed in 1806, but at that time it was considered to be premature. Consalvi would, it is certain, have hesitated long before he

¹ Pacca I, 38.

² It is printed among the documents in Pacca I, 102f.

would have fulminated an excommunication; but Pacca did not believe that the Church's thunderbolt was less effective in the nineteenth century than in the Middle Ages. Two different Bulls were drawn up, one in case the French should use force before carrying away the Pope, another in the contrary case; and it was no longer any secret that Pius VII. intended to use the strongest measures, for he felt himself driven to extremities. To the prelate of his treasury he said that he "had the mine ready, and only required to take the match in his hand to fire it off," and to another official he said: "We see well enough that the French now mean to force us to speak Latin. Well! we will do so!"¹

On 10th June 1809, shortly before noon, the Papal arms were taken down from the Castle of Sant' Angelo, amidst the thunder of guns, and the tricolour was hoisted. At the same time a decree issued by Napoleon on 18th May at Schönbrunn² was published throughout the city. By this the Papal States were united to the empire, so that the sovereignty of the Pope was abolished. As soon as this news reached the Quirinal, Pacca hastened to the Pope, and both exclaimed, *Consummatum est!* Pius, however, still hesitated a little when it came to publishing the Bull of excommunication. He said that he had again read it through, and he thought that some expressions used in it about the French government were too strong; but Pacca maintained that the language was not too severe, and that, on the contrary, they had waited too long before protesting seriously against the violent action of the French. These words struck Pius VII. He returned to his desk and signed a protest in Italian, and then ordered the Bull to be posted at the usual places: at St Peter's, at the Church of the Lateran, and at Santa Maria Maggiore. Before sunset it was done by the hands of pious and brave men, and when the Romans returned from vespers they could see the mighty document with its big letters, until the French came and tore it down.

In this Bull,³ *Quam memoranda*, the Pope first of all enumerates all the sufferings which the Church and her ministers had had to undergo. These had been so great

¹ Pacca I, 86.

² *Correspondance de Napoléon I.* XIX, 19.

³ Printed in Pacca I, 114f. in Latin and German; in French, in Artaud II, 525.

that it was no longer possible to show forbearance. "But we pray that those men will come to see that according to the law of Christ they are subject to our throne, and are placed under our supremacy. For we also have a kingdom, and a far better one (*etiam præstantius*), and it would be absurd to say that the spirit must obey the flesh, the heavenly obey the earthly."¹ The Pope is constrained to draw the punishing sword of Holy Church, but it is done in the hope that those who are against him will repent. Then follows the usual form of excommunication against all who have presumed to use violence against the Church, and against their assistants, and lastly, the command is given to proclaim the fulmination "in all places and amongst all nations."

Pacca assures us that this Bull made the Romans rejoice, and there is no reason to doubt that such a step was greeted with joy by faithful Catholics, who saw the Pope in such mournful circumstances. But the imprisonment of Pius VII. in Rome was only a half-measure. Napoleon commanded General Miollis to execute any orders that he might receive from Murat, King of Naples, with regard to the Pope, and he wrote to Murat, that, if contrary to the spirit of the Gospel the Pope dared to preach rebellion, he should be arrested.² As Miollis was afraid that serious tumults would break out in Rome, he obtained Murat's permission to arrest Pius. The night before 6th July the General had invited the *élite* of Rome to a splendid *fête* in the Palazzo Doria,³ and at three o'clock in the morning the Quirinal was surrounded. The French soldiers, commanded by General Radet, met with no resistance, because the Swiss Guard had received orders to keep back so as to avoid bloodshed. The French burst in the doors with the butt-ends of their muskets, and groped in the dark through the passages of the palace to the wing in which the Pope resided. Pacca heard the noise, and sent his nephew to the Pope to wake him. The Spanish cardinal, Despuigs y Dameto, also rushed into the Pope's room, where he was received with the exclamation: "It is all over with us now!" The courageous

¹ A quotation from Gregory of Nazianzus.

² *Correspondance de Napoléon I.* XIX, 161.

³ A. von Rennenkampff, 40.

Spaniard answered: "Your Holiness knows that to-day is the octave of the feast of St Peter and St Paul. People expect that Your Holiness will give an example of courage." "Your Eminence is right," answered the Pope, and dressed himself.¹ When he was dressed, he went down to the Audience Chamber, where Pacca and some of those nearest the Pope had gathered. When the doors were broken in, Pius VII. walked to his table, and the cardinals ranged themselves beside him. Radet, who came at the head of his men, was startled at the sight, and remained silent for some moments; he afterwards related how the memory of his First Communion rose up at this moment in his mind and held him back. At length he summoned up his courage, and, though pale, and with a shaking voice, said that he had the disagreeable duty of compelling Pius VII. to abdicate his temporal power, or else of conducting him to General Miollis. The Pope answered that he could not abdicate what was not his own: he was only steward of the Papal States. Thereupon he and Pacca were led to the gate of the Quirinal, where a carriage was in waiting for them. Despuigs accompanied the Pope to the carriage door and begged for the departing Pope's blessing and absolution. As a punishment for this hardihood he was shut up in the *Collegium Romanum*. Instead of driving to General Miollis, the carriage turned out of the city, and Radet apologised to his prisoner for the untruth he had uttered. Outside the Porta del Popolo post-horses were in waiting, and with them they went on, away from Rome, upon the road to Florence. In spite of their distress the Pope and his Minister could not help smiling, when they discovered, on looking into their purses, their apostolic poverty. The Pope had only twenty *baiocchi*, the Cardinal fifteen. Pius VII. jestingly showed the contents of his purse to Radet, who was in the same carriage, and said: "There, you see what is left to me of my kingdom!" Pacca meanwhile was seized with an anxious thought:—Was the Pope sorry for the excommunication? It was this which had brought him into such distress, and Pacca, as has been shown above, was to a great extent the cause of its being issued. But his anxiety soon disappeared, for Pius said with a smile and a satisfied air: "My Lord

¹ Maury I, 221.

Cardinal, we did well in publishing the Bull of excommunication on 10th June, for now we could not have done it."

From Florence they travelled through Genoa and Turin to Grenoble, and from thence by Valence, Avignon, and Nice to Savona, on the Gulf of Genoa. Pacca was then conveyed to Fenestrelle, where he was taken very ill. He complained of the severe climate, the long winter evenings, and the heretical atmosphere; for the inhabitants, who were formerly Waldensians, had after the Reformation become Calvinists.¹ The population of the different towns and villages showed Pius VII. and his Minister all possible respect, and the magistrates tolerated this, because they had not then received more detailed orders from the Emperor. But Fouché took care that the Pope was never mentioned in the *Moniteur*, and the Parisians therefore obtained no news whatever of the Pope's fate through the papers. Both the south and the north of Italy were constantly spoken of, but with regard to the great event in the city of the Tiber the greatest secrecy was maintained. Yet even in Paris there were dark rumours of the kidnapping of the Pope, and it was there believed that he was at Grenoble. On 9th August 1809, the *Moniteur* at last contained a letter of 1st August from Grenoble in which it was said: "People here are much concerned about an unknown animal which has passed through here; the traces it has left lead people to suppose that it was a reptile of a bigger kind than those which are known in France." After that, more is related about the road which the "reptile" took, and how it fell at last into a mountain stream.²

In such language did Napoleon's official organ indulge not quite five years after the coronation.

¹ Pacca II, 63f.

² *Le Moniteur Universel* for 1809, No. 221, column 870.

CHAPTER XII

IMPRISONMENT AND RELEASE

WHILE travelling to and from Bayonne, in April 1808, Napoleon stayed a short time at Bordeaux. To the Archbishop of that city, D'Aviau, he had shown special kindness, and he had reason to believe that the clergy of Bordeaux were attached to him. On his return from Bayonne he had an interview with the Archbishop and the clergy, and he used the occasion to broach the question whether divorce was permitted or not. He had, in fact, determined to divorce Josephine. An old doctor of the Sorbonne, the Abbé Thierry, who had no idea why the Emperor asked this question, immediately quoted the saying: "What therefore God hath joined together let not man put asunder." "That is all very well," answered the Emperor, "under ordinary circumstances in life; without that there would be no stability in marriage. But under circumstances of greater importance, when the welfare of the State demands it, it is quite another matter." The Abbé Thierry, however, steadfastly maintained that the Gospel knows of no exceptions. "Are you then a Protestant?" said Napoleon; "do you not acknowledge the importance of tradition?" "Tradition," answered the Abbé, "agrees with Holy Scripture, that the matrimonial bond is indissoluble." "No," said the Emperor, "tradition is on my side; I have seen that in Poland, Posen, Hungary, and other States which I have visited." Thereupon he addressed himself to the Superior General of the seminary at Bordeaux, but the latter supported the Abbé by showing that in the cases the Emperor knew of there was no question whatever of divorce. When Napoleon perceived the unanimity of the clergy on the point, he became "red with anger," and dismissed them. "What sort of people has the

Archbishop of Bordeaux around him? There is not one theologian amongst them," he said, when they were gone. But D'Aviau soon discovered that the Emperor took more than a theoretical interest in the question under debate, for Napoleon, through his Minister of Public Worship, ordered him to dismiss on the spot all the priests who had differed from their Emperor.¹

When Napoleon returned to Fontainebleau (November 1809) after the battle of Wagram and the peace of Vienna, his plan was ripe, and he communicated his decision to the unfortunate Josephine.² Negotiations were therefore commenced regarding the dissolution of the imperial marriage. The civil difficulties were easily removed, although the decree of 1806 says respecting the imperial family: "Divorce is forbidden to the members of the Imperial House of both sexes and of all ages." This prohibition Napoleon quickly got over by declaring that the regulation did not include the Emperor himself, but only his family. There was more difficulty with regard to the ecclesiastical side of the marriage. When Napoleon spoke to Cardinal Fesch about it, the latter remarked that it would be most natural to approach the Pope about it, but Napoleon refused to do so. He appealed to a court instituted by himself, and the court declared that there was no bond between the Emperor and Josephine, because the Emperor had not given his consent to the union. At the sitting of 26th December 1809, Cardinal Fesch supplied the following information on behalf of the Emperor: "The Emperor had not given, and never could have given, a true consent to this marriage. 'How,' the Emperor had said, 'could I, on the day when I founded a dynasty, marry a woman by whom I could not possibly have children?'" His Majesty declared that he had never given his consent to this marriage, which is proved by the following considerations: (1) that he had never chosen to have it blessed by the Church, although he had required that marriages in his family should so be blessed; (2) that when on a solemn occasion he had been obliged not to break

¹ Lyonnet: *Histoire de Mgr. d'Aviau* II, 561; quoted by D'Haussonville III, 182f.

² Welschinger: *Le divorce de Napoléon*, 27f; Masson: *Napoléon et les femmes*, 233f.

with the Empress (*sic*), he had desired that the marriage should be contracted without witnesses and without publicity ; (3) that he had declared before Cardinal Fesch, Marshal Duroc, and others, when the ceremony was over that he had not given his consent ; and that the circumstances of that time sufficiently prove that he could not have given it.¹ What a tissue of hypocrisy and faithlessness is disclosed by a study of the Emperor's conduct in this matter !

Even before the divorce was accomplished, Napoleon had been contemplating a fresh marriage. It was, in fact, because he desired to have heirs that he wished to divorce Josephine. His first thought was of the Emperor Alexander's sister, the Grand Duchess Anna Pavlovna of Russia, then fifteen years of age ;² but afterwards his attention was directed to Marie Louise, the daughter of the Austrian Emperor. As far as can be made out, the author of this scheme was Metternich,³ who perhaps hoped to secure his own position and that of Austria by an alliance between Austria and France founded upon a matrimonial compact. Marie Louise belonged to a family whose womenkind, as was stated during the negotiations, were wont to be very prolific. There were men amongst Napoleon's counsellors who advised him to marry a French lady capable of giving him hope of an heir. This proposal to marry the daughter of one of the brave men of France appealed directly to Napoleon ;⁴ but he dismissed it as unwise, from the political point of view. He had repeatedly observed how largely unions between the reigning families figured in the alliances of the time. A marriage with Marie Louise would politically be the most advantageous ; and that determined his choice.

In February 1810 he published a decree of the Senate, which made Rome the second city of the empire, and imposed upon the popes at their elevation an oath to the Emperor

¹ C. de Meaux was the first to bring to light this document, of which a small fragment is printed in D'Haussonville III, 228.

² *Aus Metternichs nachgelassene Papiere* I, 2, 143f. ; E. Wertheimer : *Die Heirat der Erzherzogin Marie Louise mit Napoleon* (*Archiv für oesterr. Geschichte*, Wien 1882, Vol. LXIV.), 511f. ; Talleyrand : *Mémoires* I, 447f. ; A. Vandal : *Napoléon et Alexandre I.* (Paris 1893) II, 174f.

³ See Wertheimer 506, in opposition to Metternich's own account, which is evidently not trustworthy, in the *Nachgel. Papiere* I, 98f. ; cp. P. Bailieu in the *Historische Zeitschrift*, *Neue Folge* VIII, 253f.

⁴ Talleyrand II, 7.

of France like that of the earlier popes to Charles the Great. As stipend they were to receive 2,000,000 francs a year, and palaces where they chose to live, especially in Paris and Rome. At the same time Napoleon impressed upon the Pope that "Jesus Christ had come to bless and not to upset thrones," and he further addresses him as follows: "You have enough to do, if you will attend to spiritual matters and the cure of souls. My mission is to govern the West; you must not interfere in this. If only Your Holiness had occupied yourself with the salvation of souls, the German Church would not have been in the chaotic and disorganised condition in which it now is. The popes of Rome have for a long time interfered in things that do not concern them, and have neglected the true welfare of the Church. I acknowledge you as my spiritual head, but I am your Emperor."¹

It seems strange that the Emperor, after such a decree and such a letter, should still entertain the hope of inducing Pius VII. to perform the wedding ceremony. That the thought passed before his mind has been inferred from a letter written to the Minister for Public Worship, in which he requests him to have the papal attire, especially the costly tiara, brought to Paris.² He thought, perhaps, that he could order the Pope about in the same way as he ordered his French bishops, whom he told to do incredible things. His uncle, Cardinal Fesch, for example, was always his scapegoat. If Fesch pronounced an opinion contrary to the Emperor's, Napoleon expressed himself with withering scorn. "Where did you learn that?" he would ask. "In Italy, while you catered for bread for my soldiers? Let people who understand things speak of what you do not understand. I do not care a whit to know what you think."³ However, it is most probable that the above-mentioned order to bring the papal attire to Paris was in no way connected with the intended wedding ceremony, but with the possible election of a new pope. With this prospect in view the Emperor had shortly before given orders to his Minister of Public Worship, Count Bigot de Préameneu, with regard to the cardinals at Rome. On 29th September, he wrote to the Minister: "I wish you to begin to send the French cardinals

¹ *Correspondance de Napoléon I.* XX, 1, 195f.

² *Ibid.*, 200.

³ D'Haussonville III, 237.

to Paris. When this first step has been taken, we shall be able to see what it will be expedient to do with the cardinals of the kingdom of Italy." On 18th December of the same year, he wrote in like manner to the Minister, "M. Bigot de Préameneu, repeat the order to General Miollis to cause all the cardinals in Rome, and especially Cardinal di Pietro, to leave. This order must be executed within twenty-four hours after the receipt of this letter; if not, punishment for disobedience will follow."¹

Before this letter arrived, Miollis had already begun to carry out his Emperor's wish. With the exception of some feeble old men who could not bear the journey, all the cardinals were sent to Paris, whether they liked it or not. Consalvi and Di Pietro, however, would not obey the order, because they could not leave Rome without the Pope's permission. But when Miollis had received the Emperor's last letter, he made short work with them. In the night preceding 10th December, soldiers entered Consalvi's apartment, and forced him to make ready for a journey, and to get into a carriage. In the carriage he found Di Pietro, and the two travelled together by short stages, so that they did not reach Paris before 20th February.² Although Consalvi was on friendly terms with the Emperor's family, and with several of the leading men in the French capital, he kept himself as much as possible aloof from all society, because he considered that he owed it to his position as a cardinal of the Roman Church, and as a friend of the Pope; but not all the cardinals had as much tact.³ Moreover Consalvi, Di Pietro, and two other cardinals refused to receive the "pension" of 30,000 francs which Napoleon allowed the cardinals, and which the majority of them accepted after quieting their consciences with various less distasteful, but also less honourable, paraphrases of the word "pension." Although Consalvi was hard pressed for funds, he continued to refuse every gift of money; and in order to obtain the means of livelihood, he even sold the snuff-box which the Emperor had given him after the conclusion of the Concordat.

¹ These two letters are not in the great collection of Napoleon's letters, but amongst the documents in D'Haussonville III, 465, 468.

² Consalvi II, 167f.

³ Pacca II, 89 and Consalvi II, 171, complain bitterly of the behaviour of the cardinals. Consalvi, on the other hand, is not, as Gams II, 279 supposes, touched by the complaints of Pacca. Cp. Consalvi II, 173.

But although Consalvi kept away from society, he could not avoid paying some visits, and, in particular, he had to be presented to Napoleon. Together with Di Pietro and three other cardinals who had newly arrived, he was introduced to the Emperor by Fesch. As soon as Napoleon, after the other cardinals had been presented, caught sight of Consalvi, he exclaimed: "Cardinal Consalvi, how thin you have become! I scarcely knew you again." "Sire," answered Consalvi, "the years pass quickly. It is now ten years since I had the honour of paying my respects to Your Majesty." "It is true; it will soon be ten years since you came here for the Concordat. We concluded it in this room; but what has been the use of it? It has all come to nothing. Rome was determined to lose everything. I must confess that I acted unwisely in removing you from the ministry. If you had retained the post, matters would not have reached this extreme." These words were said with unfeigned kindness, but Consalvi did not forget his position; he only answered: "Sire, if I had retained the post, I should have done my duty." When Napoleon heard these words he cast a steady glance at him, and began to complain of Rome. Twice more he expressed his opinion that everything would have been different if Consalvi had remained Papal Secretary, and so, thrice in all, Consalvi had occasion to contradict him.¹

This scene was an omen of Consalvi's attitude towards the Emperor's second marriage,² which was to be celebrated at the beginning of April 1810. At nine in the evening of 15th December³ Napoleon had solemnly announced to those around him, that out of consideration for the welfare of the State, he was dissolving his marriage with Josephine. The act of divorce was then signed by all present,⁴ and the next day the great event was announced to the Senate. Shortly afterwards negotiations for the new marriage with Marie Louise were opened; and after the scruples of the Archbishop of Vienna, Count Hohenwart, with regard to the invalidity of Napoleon's first marriage had

¹ Consalvi II, 177f.

² We have an account of this meeting from Consalvi's own hand, written at Reims at the end of the year 1812. It is printed in Consalvi I, 44of.

³ Welschinger, 37f.

⁴ Welschinger gives on page 44 a facsimile of all the signatures.

been happily overcome, Maréchal Berthier, now Prince of Neufchatel and Wagram, proposed on behalf of his imperial friend to the Austrian Emperor's daughter. The inhabitants of Vienna, who were longing for peace and a return of the happy days when Kaunitz and Choiseul were at the head of affairs in the two kingdoms, received the news of the intended marriage with delight, and they made harmless jests about peasant families who are wont to fight after a marriage, whilst emperors fight before a marriage. On 11th March the preliminary wedding took place in the Augustinian church at Vienna, at which the Archduke Karl represented the imperial bridegroom. Eleven days later Marie Louise set foot on French soil.¹ Napoleon met his bride in the neighbourhood of Soissons, and conducted her to Compiègne. On Saturday, 31st March, the Empress-designate proceeded from Compiègne to Saint Cloud, where there was a grand reception. On the following day the civil contract was to be signed at Saint Cloud ; on the Monday the ecclesiastical wedding ceremony was to take place in the Tuileries, and on Tuesday their Majesties would receive congratulations.

Altogether twenty-nine cardinals were then in Paris, and they were all invited to the wedding ; but not all of them could or would go. Cardinal Caprara was in his second childhood, and Fesch was to perform the wedding ceremony, so that those two must be left out of the reckoning. Of the remainder, thirteen (amongst them Mattei, Della Somaglia, Di Pietro, Galeffi, Opizzoni, and Consalvi) intended to stay away both from the civil and from the religious function ; but the fourteen others (amongst them Giuseppe and Antonio Doria, Caselli, Spina, Maury, Ruffo, and Albani) chose to be present at everything. Through Fesch, the Emperor learnt the intention of the thirteen cardinals, but he did not believe that they would dare to carry their hostile views into practice.

All the twenty-seven cardinals were present by agreement at Saint Cloud, at the reception on 31st March. When Consalvi arrived, the Commissioner of Police, Fouché, went to him to question him about the intentions of the thirteen. Consalvi thought it best to answer the enquiry honestly, and he gave a detailed explanation of the reasons that compelled the

¹ A. Vandal II, 314f. Welschinger, 158f.

cardinals to stay away. The conversation was interrupted by the entrance of their Majesties. When the Emperor, who introduced those present to Marie Louise, came to the circle of cardinals, he exclaimed, "Oh! the cardinals!" and thereupon he mentioned the name of every one of them. When he came to Consalvi, he said: "This is the man who concluded the Concordat!" By this and by similar kind words he wished to entice the cardinals to abandon their defiant attitude; but he was not successful. The thirteen stayed away from the signing of the civil contract the next day; and even two of the fourteen felt scruples about taking part in a ceremony which the Church of Rome condemned, and were attacked by indisposition.

On Monday, 2nd April, the entry into Paris was to take place, and the ecclesiastical marriage was to be performed in the Tuileries.¹ As the thirteen cardinals absented themselves also on that day, the chairs which were placed for them were removed in order to conceal their absence. Some of the fourteen were again in default, but as they pleaded sickness as their excuse, they were considered as having been present. Napoleon entered the chapel with a pleased look, but when he saw only eleven cardinals sitting there, he became very angry. Consalvi relates that the Emperor's glance "presaged the ruin of all the princes of the Church who were not present at the wedding ceremony." And his revenge was not long delayed. The day after, all the cardinals appeared at Court in full costume. First of all, the senators were admitted to offer their congratulations, and with them went Fesch, who on that day preferred being a senator to being a cardinal. After the Senate came the *Conseil d'Etat* and the Legislative Assembly, to the great annoyance of the cardinals, who were not accustomed to be placed so low on the ladder of precedence. But a still greater humiliation was in store for them. An officer was ordered by the Emperor to send the thirteen refractory cardinals home. "The eyes of everyone," says Consalvi, "were turned towards the cardinals as they were shown to the door. They had to go through rooms which were full of people." To the fourteen who were at length admitted, Napoleon gave vent to his wrath; he was especially angry with Opizzoni and Consalvi, most of all

¹ Lyonnet II, 250. Welschinger, 205f.

with the latter. "He was most culpable. He had not acted upon theological prejudices, for he had none, but out of hatred, enmity, and revenge, because he had been expelled from the ministry at Napoleon's bidding. He was a crafty diplomatist, who had wished to set a most carefully devised political trap, for he had endeavoured to raise the most dangerous opposition to the Emperor's successors, by making them illegitimate." The Emperor even threatened to have Consalvi and two other cardinals shot.

The next day, at eight o'clock in the evening, the thirteen cardinals received a written summons to meet at nine o'clock at the office of the Minister of Public Worship, to receive the Emperor's orders.¹ All of them came, and found Fouché also there. As soon as they were seated, the Minister made a long speech, which he concluded by announcing to them (1) that their property was confiscated, and their emoluments withdrawn; (2) that the Emperor would not have them cardinals any longer, and that he forbade them to wear the insignia of that dignity; (3) that the Emperor would later on decide as to their future place of abode. Legal proceedings would be instituted against some of them. The cardinals defended themselves against the accusations of the Minister—not without effect, it would seem,² and both he and Fouché declared that they wished to see a happy ending to the affair, both for the cardinals' sakes, and for the sake of the empire.

The cardinals thereupon repaired to Cardinal Mattei's lodgings, and there they composed during the night their defence, which in the course of the next day was sent to the Minister, in order that he might present it to the Emperor. The Emperor, however, had left for St Quentin, and, in consequence, his former orders held good; the thirteen were "decardinalised," and, as "black" cardinals, formed a contrast to the "red," who were willing to follow the Emperor's bidding. Two months passed, in which the black cardinals parted with their carriages, and dismissed their servants, and hired poor lodgings, because in future they were to depend on charitable gifts. But at the

¹ The Emperor's orders are amongst the documents in D'Haussonville III, 469f, but not in the large collection. A part of the Minister's account of the meeting is to be found in the same place, p. 271.

² Consalvi II, 212f.

beginning of June they were once more summoned to the Minister, to receive the announcement that they were to be sent to different places of exile about the country. Consalvi and Brancodoro were sent to Reims, and it was there that the former Papal Secretary wrote his *Memoirs*. At the same time Pacca was imprisoned at Fenestrelle in close confinement, and furtively wrote down his experiences. He was so uncomfortable there that he contests Napoleon's right afterwards to complain of Hudson Lowe at St Helena, because the Emperor himself had been still more tyrannical towards the ecclesiastics.¹

While all this was going on, Pius VII. remained a prisoner at Savona.² He arrived there on 16th August 1809; and after a few days' stay with the Prefect of the town, he received rooms in the bishop's palace, which was very poorly furnished. Napoleon had ordered that he was to receive 50,000 francs a month, and that horses and carriages were to be placed at his disposal. Livery was made for his servants, and they also were to be paid a monthly wage from the Treasury. But Pius refused to receive anything personally, and asked his servants to receive as little as possible. He lived as a complete ascetic; a few vegetables and a little fish were his only diet. He took his walks in the neglected little garden of the episcopal palace, and said his Mass daily in the plain and badly-kept chapel of the palace,³ where his attendants often saw him praying for the sovereign who formerly was the Church's guardian, but now was its oppressor. Sometimes he blessed the people from a tumbledown balcony, which he reached by a perilous staircase. He took care, as far as circumstances permitted, to fulfil his duties as Pope. His secretary was denied him, but he was allowed to make use of one of his attendants, who wrote a fairly legible hand, as a clerk.

¹ Pacca II, 69.

² H. Chotard: *Le Pape Pie VII. à Savone* (Paris 1877), a work which in the main is founded upon the daily reports of General Count Berthier at Savona to Prince Camillo Borghese, the Governor of Piedmont, and upon the unpublished *Mémoires* of Ritter von Lebzelter.

³ Count Berthier complains of the niggardliness which was always displayed with regard to the fitting up of the Pope's lodging, Chotard 15, 24. On the other hand, Napoleon declares that the Pope's lodging at Savona "est montée sur un plus haut pied que celle qu'il avait à Rome" (Metternich: *Nachgelassene Papiere* I, 2, 347).

But besides a clerk he wanted also a counsellor, and it was at one time his especial wish to have by him the octogenarian Antonelli, who, by reason of his great age, had remained in Italy. He was allowed to receive letters, but they were first sent to the Bishop of Savona, in whose apartments they were opened and read by General Berthier or the Prefect, in order that Napoleon might keep his eye on the correspondence. But the Emperor wished to know more of the Pope's thoughts, and particularly whether the moment had arrived for making peace. A very difficult controversial question had arisen in France; Napoleon had nominated some new bishops. These, according to the Concordat, ought to have canonical institution from the Pope, but on 26th August Pius VII., in a letter to Caprara, who was then Archbishop of Milan, refused to give it.¹ The Minister of Public Worship advised Napoleon to send the newly-chosen bishops to their dioceses without it,² but this would have been a plain violation of the Concordat. Yet as soon as the marriage with Marie Louise was arranged, Napoleon no longer shrank from that expedient. As he had the former Roman Emperor on his side he thought that he might do anything; an alliance between France and Austria had from time immemorial been fateful for the chair of St Peter. But as Austria at this juncture offered to mediate between the parties, he accepted the offer.

At the same time that Marie Louise was travelling to France, Metternich also went there, to find out, as he says, whether the son-in-law of his imperial master would sheathe his sword or continue his system of conquests.³ The negotiations concerning the divorce of Josephine which preceded the marriage with Marie Louise had, of course, opened the question of the relations of Napoleon to the Pope; and after the wedding Metternich suggested to Napoleon that Ritter von Lebzelter, who was on the way to Savona to treat with Pius VII. about certain Austrian affairs, might also make an attempt to mediate between the Emperor of the French and the Pope.⁴ Metternich

¹ Ricard: *Le concile national de 1811* (Paris 1894), 10f.

² See his letter in D'Haussonville III, 378.

³ *Nachgelassene Papiere* I, 1, 102f.

⁴ Cp. the despatches in Metternich's *Nachgelassene Papiere* I, 2, 339f., and Lebzelter's *Mémoires* in Chotard, 65f.

considered the rôle of mediator especially suited to the Emperor of Austria as the chief sovereign of Christendom; but in order to have something definite to go upon with the Pope, he asked Napoleon to write down some indications of his views, whilst at the same time he emphasised that these indications must be framed in a merely preliminary form, lest it should seem as if Austria wished to force the will of France upon the Pope. He had had a good opportunity of noticing how painful the controversy with Pius VII. and the Church was to Napoleon, and he hoped that an understanding between the conflicting parties would result, if the Pope would give in with regard to the purely secular power. The knowledge of the cardinals which he had gained in Paris did not make him very hopeful. But even if the negotiations should fail to lead to any result, the Austrian Emperor would not suffer by them, and might rejoice at having attempted to help forward the victory of religion.¹

In the remarks which Napoleon wrote down for the use of Lebzeltern, he declared that he would not be the cause of any schism in matters spiritual; it was his firm resolve to continue to "be attached to the religion of Saint Louis, and to the religion which French theology had professed from his time until that of Louis XV."² He would give up the idea that the Pope should live in Paris, although by collecting the cardinals and the Roman archives there, and by spending several millions on the extension and embellishment of the archiepiscopal palace in Paris, he had undoubtedly worked for the realisation of this idea. If the Pope would take up his abode at Avignon, he would not be required to renounce his former sovereignty; it would be sufficient if he promised to abstain from taking measures against France. In this case he might also be spared the oath not to violate the Gallican rights. On the other hand, if he wished to go to Rome, he must resign his temporal sovereignty; but Napoleon would not oppose the outward forms of the Pope's independence such as the receiving and sending of ambassadors and couriers. He gave Lebzeltern clearly to understand, however, that, personally, he had no need of a reconciliation; his bishops would

¹ *Nachgelassene Papiere* I, 2, 345f.

² Metternich's *Nachgelassene Papiere* I, 2, 346f.

grant him the requisite dispensations in matrimonial matters. The *Code Napoléon* authorised civil marriage, and the difficulty as to the canonical institution refused to the bishops would be surmounted by means of a Council. It was therefore the Pope who ought to take the first step. Metternich also asked Lebzelter to remind the Pope that he did not live in the Middle Ages. The evangelical spirit was weakened in dioceses which had no bishops; and canonical ideas disappeared altogether, because the Church had no head in a position to act freely.

On 27th April Lebzelter left for Savona with these instructions. Although he represented France just as much as Austria, it was extremely difficult for him to obtain admission to the imprisoned Pope; but at length he succeeded. He found Pius VII. somewhat aged, but gentle and tranquil. The Pope entertained only one wish: to obtain free communication with the bishops and the faithful, and to be allowed some of his counsellors at Savona. But he would not hear one word about the resignation of his temporal power, which Napoleon desired. He committed his cause to God, and would calmly await the end of the persecution. He was not at all unwilling to annul Napoleon's excommunication, "but in order to obtain absolution, a man must do penance," he said. His former experiences had made him very suspicious of the high-handed French Emperor. What was the use of a compact, if, perchance, "articles" were added to it which violated the agreement?

After Lebzelter's departure, Pius VII. sent a despatch to Metternich, in which he declared that, however desirous he might be of peace with Napoleon, it was quite impossible to fulfil the Emperor's demands, because he would thereby injure the dignity of the Church and of the vicar of Christ, and surrender the most sacred prerogatives, both spiritual and temporal, of the Apostolic See.

Lebzelter's account of his conversations with Pius VII. did not, of course, serve to make Napoleon more friendly disposed; they only showed him, as he said to Metternich, that the Pope was "not yet ripe."¹ The Austrian ambassador endeavoured in vain to convince Napoleon that it was a reasonable desire

¹ Metternich: *Nachgelassene Papiere* I, 2, 358.

on the part of the imprisoned Pope to have counsellors with him. Such an *entourage*, in the Emperor's opinion, would only strengthen Pius VII. in his ill-will towards France; and even if these counsellors were taken from amongst both the red and the black cardinals, he did not expect any good results from their consultations. The mediation of Austria, therefore, led to nothing. But one thing Lebzeltern had learnt on his journey, and Metternich did not conceal it from his Emperor. The Austrian diplomatist had not only observed that Napoleon's treatment of the Pope had made a great impression on the Italians, but also that all eyes were turned towards Austria. The visit of the Austrian agent to Savona had awakened general hopefulness, and there was a prospect that many minds would revolt against the oppression that rested upon that unhappy country.

When as little success attended a later attempt of Napoleon to break down the firmness of the Pope by sending to Savona the two red cardinals, Spina and Caselli, well known from the history of the Concordat, he determined to act without any regard to Pius VII. Some of the new bishops were ordered to repair immediately to their dioceses, and in all that they wrote, to use their episcopal titles, "without waiting any longer for canonical institution." He intended to follow the same course towards the premier bishop of France. Cardinal Fesch, Archbishop of Lyons, who styled himself "the primate of Gaul," since the end of 1808 had also administered the archbishopric of Paris. The Abbé Emery, one of the few ecclesiastics who commanded Napoleon's respect and admiration, endeavoured to convince the cardinal that he could not thus multiply offices, but it was of no avail. If the nephew could be both emperor and king at the same time, why should not the uncle be at the same time archbishop of two places? Napoleon, however, demanded that Fesch should accept the archbishopric of Paris in reality, should bear the title of it, and not merely administer it from a distance. "Sire," answered the Cardinal, "I will wait for the Holy Father's canonical institution." "Then," said Napoleon, "you condemn the bishops who have gone to their dioceses without it. I will, however, soon compel you to do my will." "Sire, *potius mori*," exclaimed the Cardinal.

Napoleon was angry; but suddenly he conceived the idea of

avoiding a family quarrel by a pun. "Aha! *potius mori*, rather Maury—well, well! Maury shall be Archbishop of Paris."¹ Cardinal Maury was not a man of scruples, when his own worldly advancement was concerned. The times had taught him that to follow the dictates of conscience might be attended by unpleasantness, and he never forgot that lesson. Already, on 1st December 1803, he, the friend of Louis XVIII. and the consolation of the Bourbons, had approached the victorious First Consul,² and on 1st August 1804 he had burned his boats and offered his services to the Emperor.³ Napoleon, not without mistrust, had received the renegade. In 1805 the Emperor saw Maury for the first time, in Genoa, after the coronation at Milan. Five minutes' conversation sufficed to dazzle the ambitious Cardinal, and to win him entirely over to the Emperor's side. And Talleyrand was ordered to let Consalvi know that Maury had been taken into the Emperor's favour, "who receives all Frenchmen with goodwill." Afterwards Maury came to Paris. He played some part there in the divorce, and his elastic conscience permitted him—as well as his old friend in the Conclave, Ruffo—to assist both at the civil contract and at the ecclesiastical wedding. As soon as he received the tempting offer of the Archbishopric of Paris he immediately left Montefiascone, and the want of canonical institution did not trouble him. As he left the Emperor's audience chamber he met Pasquier, the newly-appointed Commissioner of Police, in the corridor of the palace. With his rough humour Maury said to him: "Well, the Emperor has now supplied two of the greatest wants of the capital! With good police and good clergy, he can always be sure of public tranquillity, for, after all, an archbishop is also a sort of Prefect of Police." This humour greatly displeased Pasquier, and in his *Mémoires* he expresses his contempt for this clumsy plebeian, who had become the head of the French clergy although he was a person strangely without tact and avaricious to a ridiculous degree.⁴

¹ Lyonnet: *Vie du Cardinal Fesch* II, 174; Ricard: *Le Cardinal Fesch*, 227f. The truth of this anecdote is disputed by the Abbé Cattet. Maury: *Mémoires* II, 389.

² Maury II, 306.

³ *Ibid.*, 316f.; Mme. de Rémusat: *Mémoires* II, 150f.

⁴ *Mémoires du Chancelier Pasquier* (Paris 1893) I, 415f.

Maury, however, was not to enjoy his exalted position quietly. In the Chapter of Nôtre Dame there were some who would not acquiesce in such a violation of the Church's laws; amongst them the young Capitular-Vicar, the Abbé d'Astros. He protested frequently in a manner most disagreeable to Maury, and in the presence of others, against the Cardinal's right to the archbishopric, and protests soon came from a greater personage.

On 16th October Maury announced to Pius VII. that the Emperor had offered him the Archbishopric of Paris.¹ The answer of the imprisoned Pope was a letter in which he told the Cardinal that he had betrayed the Church. "You are not ashamed," wrote Pius, "of taking part against us in a contest, which we only carry on in order to defend the dignity of the Church!" It was unheard of in the annals of the Church that a bishop should assume the government of a diocese without the Pope's canonical institution; and who had dissolved the tie that bound Maury to Montefiascone? Maury ought therefore to resign at once an office to which he had no right.²

With regard to this disagreeable letter from the Pope, Maury adopted the plan of taking no notice. Some years afterwards, when it was printed, he denied in a memorandum, which he wrote as his apology, that he had ever received Pius VII.'s letter.³ But on this point he has not been believed.⁴ In another manner he learnt that the Pope disapproved of his action. A Society of Catholic Christians had been formed, which openly assisted the Pope with alms, but secretly circulated his letters. By this means D'Astros learned that Pius VII. disapproved of the appointment of Maury, and this leaked out in Paris. At the end of 1810 the French police intercepted a letter from the Pope, addressed to D'Astros, which said, that in order to remove any reason for doubt, and for the sake of greater precaution, the Pope deprived the archbishop, nominated by the Emperor, of all authority and all right of jurisdiction, and he "declared null and void everything done contrary to his command, whether done wittingly or unwittingly."

¹ Maury II, 392f.

² *Ibid.*, 394f.

³ *Ibid.*, 459.

⁴ Cp. Poujoulat, quoted in Maury II, 397.

This letter made Napoleon furious. When the clergy congratulated him on New Year's Day, 1811, he said to Maury, "Where are your vicars?" When D'Astros was presented, the Emperor cried to him: "Above everything, Monsieur, a man ought to be a Frenchman; that is the way to be at the same time a good Christian. The teaching of Bossuet is the only guidance to be followed; it is a sure preventive of error. The religion of Bossuet is as different from that of Gregory VII. as heaven is from hell. I know, Monsieur, that you are opposed to the regulations which my policy prescribes. You are the only suspicious man in my empire. However" (and here the Emperor laid his hand upon his sword), "I have a sword at my side; be careful."¹ As soon as the audience was over, Maury informed D'Astros that the Prefect of Police wished to "ask him some questions," and the Archbishop drove to the Prefecture himself with his Capitular - Vicar. After examining the memory and the pockets of D'Astros, they forced him to confess that he had been in communication with the Pope, and he was then allowed to depart. But Napoleon was so exasperated when he heard about his confession, that at first he wished to have him shot. This sentence, however, was altered into imprisonment for life, and the Abbé had to remain in confinement at Vincennes, until the fall of the empire.²

But this was not enough for the Emperor: Pius VII. also must be punished. One night, in the beginning of January, the Prefect of Savona forced himself into the Pope's apartments and made a domestic search. All the drawers were opened; even the dresses of the Pope and his servants were ripped open in order to make sure that nothing was hidden in them. Afterwards they forced the Pope's writing table open, while he took his walk in the little garden. They deprived him of pen and ink and of all books, even of his breviaries and of his Office of Our Lady; and everything was sent to Genoa to be examined by French police officers. In future Pius VII. was only to be allowed to read the *Moniteur*, and this became less and less pleasant reading for him; for the time had long

¹ D'Haussonville III, 428, according to the Abbé d'Astros' personal narrative in writing. Cp. the *Mémoires de Pasquier* I, 441, and Maury II, 401f.

² D'Haussonville IV, 7; *Mémoires de Pasquier* I, 442.

gone by since it reported the Emperor's benevolence towards the Church. His most attached servants, amongst them his old barber, were sent to Fenestrelle; and hands were even laid upon some gold pieces, which faithful Catholics had given to him. His household expenses hereafter were to be cut down, so that only five *paoli* (about two shillings) a head were allowed for all necessaries to each person,¹ and the carriages that had been at his disposal were sent to Turin. These two regulations were quite meaningless, because the Pope required scarcely anything for himself, and had never used the carriages.² He was not allowed to keep even the Fisherman's Ring, in order that he might not use it as a signet. The captain of the gendarmes demanded the delivery of it, and it was given to him, but broken in two.

At the same time there appeared at the instance of Napoleon certain publications intended to defend his action, and the imperial librarian, Barbier, had been occupied since January 1810 in investigating whether there were any precedents of popes being suspended or dismissed by emperors.³ Historical science was now to be harnessed to the Emperor's triumphal car; but passion did more. Napoleon now believed firmly that the "clerical rabble" had conspired against him, and his anger knew no bounds. One after another of the clergy, from cardinals to priests, was "removed"; and even ladies, well known for their piety and church sympathies, were thrown into state prisons. But all this did not throw the mantle of legality over the Emperor's church policy; this was to be the work of a Franco-Italian Council.

Already, in 1809, Napoleon had instituted an ecclesiastical commission,⁴ and had laid several questions before it, partly

¹ D'Haussonville IV, 129.

² Napoleon's letters on this question were never printed until D'Haussonville (III, 437) published them. They are also omitted in the large collection, probably because, as the preface to the thirteenth volume says, they do not belong to the letters which Napoleon I. would have wished to make public, "si . . . il avait voulu montrer à la postérité sa personne et son système." But they throw unmistakable light both on the person and on the system.

³ *Correspondance de Napoléon I.* XXI, 413.

⁴ Talleyrand: *Mémoires* II, 517; Ricard: *Le concile national de 1811* (Paris 1894), 15f. This work is based upon the official documents that have recently been discovered among Cardinal Fesch's personal records at Lyons.

regarding the whole Church, partly the Church of France, amongst other things the question of calling together a council. The only member of this commission who had any church feeling was the Abbé Émery; it was most painful to him to see his colleagues go so far as to count the conferring of the *légion d'honneur* and of titles amongst the good things which the Emperor had done for religion.¹ He had even stronger reason to be grieved when he saw how far the commission could go in lowering itself upon reassembling in 1811. He determined, therefore, to express his own view of the circumstances when the commission, after its work was ended, had an audience of the Emperor on 16th March.²

With great boldness he reminded the Emperor that it was stated in the Imperial Catechism that "the Pope was the visible Head of the Church." In the preface to the Propositions of 1682, it was also clearly stated that St Peter's primacy is derived from Christ Himself, and that Christians owe obedience to the Pope. Napoleon was impressed, but not angry with the bold priest; he entered upon a discussion with him, and remarked, amongst other things, that he would not deny the spiritual authority of the Pope, since he had it from Christ. "But," he said, "Christ did not give him the temporal power; that Charles the Great did. I am the successor of Charles the Great, and I take it from him again, because he does not know how to use it, and because it hinders him in exercising his spiritual functions." When the Abbé argued that Bossuet explicitly maintains that the Pope must have perfect liberty in order to be able to exercise his spiritual power, Napoleon pointed out to him that the times were now quite changed. In Bossuet's time Europe had several rulers, now it had only one; and as all other sovereigns bowed to this one, why should not the Pope also do the same? The Abbé Émery did not give in; he answered in such a way that the Emperor was silent. All the court officials wondered at his courage, and some of the bishops were weak enough to apologise to Napoleon for his boldness; but the Emperor declared that Émery had spoken like a man of sense; he wished that everybody would speak

¹ É. Méric: *Histoire de M. Émery* II, 326, and *Revue des questions historiques* I, 2, 564f.

² D'Haussonville IV, 80f.; Talleyrand II, 78f.

in like manner.¹ A few days later Fesch received the following answer, when he wished to make some remarks: "You had better keep quiet! You are an ignorant person. Where did you learn theology? I must have a talk with Émery about the matter; he understands it." Unfortunately for the Church of France, Émery's days were soon numbered. The Church's misfortunes preyed upon him, and when he heard that the Emperor intended to carry into effect the scheme of a church Council, he died, on 28th April 1811. "In order to guard against a condition of things which is as much opposed to religion as to the principles of the Gallican Church and the interests of the State," so ran the phrase in the invitation to the Council²—the Emperor had decided to gather together all the bishops of France and Italy to a meeting in the church of Nôtre Dame on 9th June. After the invitations had been sent out, Napoleon despatched three of his faithful bishops to Savona to reopen negotiations with the Pope, hoping that the prospect of a church Council would frighten him. He gave Pius VII. the choice between two things: a residence in Rome, if he would take the same oath as the French bishops did according to the Concordat—or at Avignon, if he would acknowledge the four Gallican Propositions.³ On 9th May 1811 the bishops arrived at Savona, and on the following day they were received in audience by Pius VII.

During the discussions which followed, Pius VII. showed great firmness, though with courtesy. He did not wish to do anything contrary to the declaration of 1682; but he could not recall the Bull of condemnation of it, which Alexander VIII. had published on the day before he died. With regard to the canonical institution of the French bishops he would perhaps have been willing to give way, if such cruel treatment had not been meted out to the Church. As the bishops could make no impression, the Prefect made an attempt. He employed both threats and persuasion, and tried all manner of means. The incessant pressure upon Pius VII. put him into a restless state of fever; he could not sleep at nights, and in the daytime he was languid. Wearied out by the pressure put upon him,

¹ Méric II, 409.

² Ricard: *Le concile national de 1811*, 95f.

³ *Correspondance de Napoléon I.* XXII, 17,656.

he gave in and agreed to the addition of an appendix to the Concordat, by which he promised to give the bishops, whom the Emperor appointed, canonical institution within six months; if a longer period elapsed, for other reasons than regard to the unworthiness of the persons, the metropolitan or the senior bishop of the province should be allowed to consecrate them. In the document which contains this agreement it is added that the concessions have been made in the hope that the Papal See may soon regain its liberty and independence.¹ The document was not signed, however, in order that it might not appear to be a treaty, but only an expression of the Pope's will.² As soon as the bishops, with the help of the Prefect and the Pope's doctor, had induced Pius to grant these concessions, they departed; but they had scarcely left Savona before Pius VII. regretted his compliance. He wished to recall the bishops, and he set about correcting the articles that had been drawn up; but it was too late. When he realised it, he sank into a state that bordered upon mental derangement.

While the unhappy Pope was thus suffering both bodily and spiritual torments, the church Council was opened at Paris on 17th June 1811.³ Altogether ninety-five French and Italian bishops were summoned to the capital, and these were joined by nine bishops-elect, who had not yet received their consecration. The meetings were held in the roomy choir of Nôtre Dame. The Bishop of Troyes opened the meeting with a speech in which he endeavoured to give both the Emperor and the Pope their due.⁴ But people were so tired of hearing the Emperor praised, that no attention was paid to the speaker's homage to him; on the other hand, they listened with astonishment to the Bishop's expression of great attachment to the Pope. Fesch had read through the speech before it was delivered, and cancelled several passages of it, but the Bishop of Troyes took no notice of his censorship. Afterwards, Fesch himself advanced, and caused the Council, after the manner of older councils, to swear allegiance to the Pope. The Emperor was furious, both with the

¹ Cp. the account given by the Archbishop of Tours, among the documents in D'Haussonville IV, 422f.; especially 430.

² Thiers XIII, 136.

³ Talleyrand: *Mémoires* II, 98f.; D'Haussonville IV, 166f., 371; De Pradt II, 473f.; and Ricard, 119f., 136f.

⁴ Ricard, 142f.

contents of the opening speech and with the taking of the oath, although this last was indisputably necessary unless a tinge of heresy was to be thrown over the Council from the very beginning.

On the evening of 18th June a number of the Council were invited to Saint Cloud. As soon as they entered the room where Napoleon was, he seized the number of the *Moniteur* which reported the first meeting of the Council, and turned upon the bishops with the strongest invectives. The unfortunate Fesch had to bear the brunt of it. Napoleon scoffed at him, because he had called himself the Primate of Gaul without imperial permission. He considered it a sign that Fesch wished to advance himself, and that on account of his relation to the Emperor he hoped perhaps to be made Pope. "A nice Pope, to be sure!" he exclaimed. When Fesch answered, and some of the bishops came to his succour, Napoleon became still more exasperated. He cried: "These gentlemen treat me as if I were Saint Louis, but I am Charles the Great! Yes, I am Charles the Great!" This disagreeable collision only came to an end after Napoleon had talked till he was tired; and to prevent a fresh outbreak of the Emperor's anger, the Bishop of Nantes begged to have a private conversation with him. At midnight the bishops went home anything but edified by their visit to Saint Cloud.¹

At the session of 20th June the French and Italian Ministers of Public Worship entered in their official costume, and the former read out an imperial decree, whereby Napoleon chose Fesch as president, and demanded the institution of a committee of police (*un bureau chargé de la police de l'assemblée*), which, as in some of the former councils, was to keep order; both the imperial Ministers of Public Worship were to be members of it. The assembly was dismayed at the Emperor's demand and at the hateful name of a bureau of police; but it bowed to his will after altering the name to that of "interior administration."¹ Napoleon, however, always employed in the official language the word which he had chosen himself. The French Minister then read the imperial message to the Council. It was full of the most violent attacks upon the Pope and his Bulls; "which were drawn up in the language of Gregory VII., and displeased everyone." Mention was made of Pius VII.'s

¹ Talleyrand II, 99f.

"unhappy projects," which never came to anything, and the message ended with threats. His Majesty gave the assembled bishops to understand that he would never allow the Pope to exercise the same influence in France in the appointments to vacant dioceses as he exercised in Germany in the appointment of vicars apostolic. He had become fully convinced that the English and other nations were right when they asserted that the Catholic religion was a hindrance to the independence of the government. The Emperor wished, therefore, "as Emperor and King, as the defender of the Church, and father of his people," that the bishops should be instituted as they were before the Concordat, and that a see should not be left vacant for more than three months.¹ This was reckless language to use to an assembly of servants of the Roman Church, and the Minister's speech involved a breach of the Concordat and of the latest arrangements with the Pope; but the Synod was quite helpless. Napoleon wished to influence the election of the committees; the meetings were to be secret, and no account of them was to be printed without being previously read by the Emperor. Most of the prelates present were filled with admiration of the Emperor's mighty genius; but only a small group, like Maury, De Pradt, the confessor of Marie Louise, Duvoisin of Nantes,² and those prelates who had recently pleaded Napoleon's cause with the Pope, were quite won over to the Emperor's plans. The message which the Minister had to deliver nearly frightened the majority of the assembly away from Napoleon; the wondering bishops felt "like a body of pilgrims in the desert, who suddenly hear the roar of a lion." The vacillating attitude of the assembly found its expression in the President's behaviour: Cardinal Fesch was by turns the uncle of the Emperor and a bishop of the Roman Church.

The first duty of the assembly was an answer to the Emperor's message, and a committee was chosen to draw it up. When they met, Duvoisin produced an answer, which was, he said, "approved by Napoleon"; he might have said,

¹ Ricard, 155f.

² About his work in the confessional, see *Mémorial* V, 328f. Napoleon calls him there, "Mon oracle, mon flambeau." Cp. Pacca III, 64, and Chaptal: *Mes souvenirs sur Napoléon*, 241f.

"written by Napoleon." He acted somewhat rudely, and the committee considered his behaviour so offensive that the draft of the answer was very much altered before it was presented to the whole assembly. But it received no friendly treatment there. The Bishop-Coadjutor of Münster, Kaspar Maximilian Droste zu Vischering, rose and said that he did not see in the draft the most important thing of all—namely, a petition to have the Pope restored to perfect liberty. When some objected that this was not the moment to express such a wish, another bishop said: "Now is the very time to follow the Apostle's exhortation: Be instant in season and out of season, reprove, rebuke, exhort!" Fesch then spoke, and said that an address on behalf of the Pope would find a more suitable place in the decisions with regard to the canonical institution of bishops; but this view did not obtain support. At a later meeting no greater inclination was shown to comply with the Emperor's wishes, although Duvoisin again declared that Napoleon insisted upon the draft which he had laid before them. They gave in so far as to cut down their alterations to some extent; but it was also decided that only the President and the Secretaries should sign the address. This conclusion of the debate on the address stirred Napoleon's anger afresh. He wished to know what the alterations consisted of, and declared that he would hear no more of the address, still less receive it; he even withdrew an invitation to the bishops, who had been invited to an audience. On the other hand, he demanded that the assembly should in the course of a week give a declaration of its view as to the canonical institution. Two of the bishops had cause to feel how angry he was, when he said to them: "I wished to make you cardinals; it will be your own fault if you sink down to be beadles. The Pope refuses to carry out the regulations of the Concordat; very well! then we will no longer have a Concordat."

The question of canonical institution was in reality the main question.¹ An early settlement of this question seemed to De Pradt and others to be a necessary measure of self-defence; it would in their opinion be spiritual suicide if the clergy did not get this matter arranged as soon as possible. But it was very difficult to do. An easy solution would be

¹ De Pradt II, 479. Ricard, 198f.

to ask permission to send a message to the Pope ; but Napoleon would not allow of that. The members of the assembly were ignorant of the last agreement with Pius VII., and they had no idea, as Napoleon had, that the Pope was then nearly mad with grief because of the concessions which had been wrung from him. The Emperor demanded that the Council should first pass a decree and then send a message to the Pope. A committee was therefore appointed to consider the question of canonical institution, and Fesch laid before the committee a letter from the Minister of Public Worship on behalf of Napoleon, in which he asked for a clear answer to the question whether the Council considered itself competent to come to a decision on the subject of canonical consecration.¹ He received the answer : "The committee begs permission to consult with the Pope." Fesch, who carried this message to the Emperor, met with the usual reception. When he wished to say a few words in defence, Napoleon said : "Hold your tongue about theology ! If I had but studied for six months, I should know more about it than you do." He threatened also to "cashier the Council" ; the prefects could then appoint the priests, the chapters, and the bishops. In case the metropolitan would not give them canonical institution, he would close the seminaries, so that religion should have no more ministers. Upon this the bishop gained the victory over the uncle in Cardinal Fesch's breast : "If you want to have martyrs," he said boldly to the Emperor, "then begin with your own family ! I am ready to seal my faith with my life. So long as the Pope does not give his sanction, I, as Archbishop, will not institute any of my suffragans. Yes, I will even go further : if any one of my suffragans dares to consecrate a bishop in my province, I will immediately excommunicate him."

The former storekeeper did not usually speak in this manner, and his words seem to have made Napoleon hesitate. At the same time news arrived from Savona that the Pope's excitement had given way to a quiet melancholy, which did not shut out the hope of a peaceful understanding. Under these circumstances Napoleon changed his tactics. The deputation to Savona were ordered to relate what they had hitherto kept secret about their journey. Napoleon then called his secretary,

¹ Documents in D'Haussonville IV, 418.

and dictated to him a document, which was hereafter to form the basis for the discussions of the Council.¹ In this document it is stated that a deputation had visited the Pope in order to make arrangements about the matter under discussion; and it is proposed that the Council should pass a decree, requesting the Emperor to adopt the latest agreement with the Pope as the law of the State, and to send new envoys to the Pope "to thank him for having by this concession put an end to the misfortunes of the Church."

This was a turn worthy of a great general. Fesch and Duvoisin, who knew nothing of the Pope's remorse over the concessions—for that was still concealed—called the Emperor's production "an inspiration," and their enthusiasm infected the other members of the committee. With few exceptions, they agreed almost with joy to the imperial decree; all were deceived by seeing the Pope mentioned. But when the first enthusiasm had given place to calmer consideration they took another view of the matter, and Fesch was honest enough not to cheat them. As soon as he perceived the change of feeling, he laid the imperial decree before them next day for fresh discussion, and it was then rejected. This was a sign that the majority of the committee suspected the Emperor's truthfulness and honesty. Fesch had once more the disagreeable task of reporting to the Emperor that his latest proposal had no chance of being adopted. Napoleon's patience then gave way. On 10th July a general session of no importance was held, but on the following day it was announced that the Council was closed. Then came the usual sequel: the Bishop of Troyes and two more bishops of the opposition were dragged out of their beds by the police and taken to Vincennes, where they were thrown into close confinement.²

Fresh reports now arrived from the Prefect at Savona; Pius VII., it was said, was recovering, and there was a better prospect of reconciliation. Napoleon at once resolved to make use of the chance of an agreement thus opened; and the Council was ordered to reassemble. Some of the bishops, who had most strongly opposed the Emperor's design, had left

¹ D'Haussonville IV, 328f.

² Talleyrand II, 105. Ricard, 245f.

Paris ; but that would only assist the negotiations ; the others were ordered to remain.¹ Before the Council reassembled, Napoleon attempted to influence the prelates by promises and threats, and on the whole he succeeded, but not in every case. One day he was employing his usual tactics with Bishop Miollis, a brother of the Governor of Rome, with the object of inducing him to support his part. "Sire," answered the pious Bishop, "I never make any important decision without taking counsel of the Holy Spirit ; I ask, therefore, for time for consideration." Four days after Napoleon met Miollis again, and asked him : "Well, Monsieur l'Évêque, what has the Holy Spirit said to you ?" "Sire," answered the Bishop, "the very opposite of what Your Majesty has said."²

On 5th August the Council held its last general session. The Archbishop of Tours read a complete account of the interview with the Pope, and a verbatim report of the points he had conceded. There was no opportunity for debate ; the meeting had only to bow to the will of the Emperor, and say Amen to what he had dictated. Maury hastened to say that all discussion was "useless," because they were agreed. And about what ? "The National Council," they decreed, "has in an emergency the right to decide with regard to the consecration of bishops." And what is an emergency ? "In case the Pope," they further decreed, "refuses to sanction the decree which the Council adopts regarding the consecration of bishops, then there is an emergency." A resolution was then passed³ that the Emperor should in future appoint the bishops, and that the Pope should give them canonical institution. If the Pope did not give it within six months, the archbishop or the senior bishop of the province might do so. The assembly asked the Emperor to confirm the decree, and to permit a deputation of six bishops to request the Pope to sanction this decision, which alone could put an end to the misfortunes of the Church in France and Italy. More than five-sixths of the prelates who were present agreed, having been persuaded one by one, either by threats or by promises, and the decree

¹ Talleyrand II, 106f. ; Ricard 254f.

² Bishop Miollis is reported to have furnished Victor Hugo with several traits for his description of the Bishop in *Les Misérables*.

³ Printed in Ricard 260f.

was passed. "Our wine did not taste well in the cask," said Cardinal Maury; "it is better in bottles."

Pius VII. knew next to nothing of the Council at Paris; the Prefect of Savona himself had very little acquaintance with what was happening, and the little he knew he concealed from the Pope. He must, therefore, have been highly astonished when in the beginning of September he received a deputation from the Council.¹ It was a matter of course that Napoleon had appointed the members of it, and that he had chosen only friends of the empire. They had been ordered to ask for a full recognition of the decree. In order to induce the Pope to comply, the Imperial government sent some cardinals also to Savona, amongst others Ruffo; they were to endeavour to remove all the Pope's scruples. The unhappy Pius VII., thus betrayed and tormented on all sides, gave in and signed a brief on 20th September 1871, approving the contents of the decree.² He resigned thereby the sole right of the Pope to grant canonical institution; and that was a very serious step. It is true that the archbishops of the period before the Concordat of Francis I. had instituted the bishops, but at that time the election was in the hands of the Church and not of the State, as was the case after the Concordat of Napoleon. As soon as the brief was ready, it was sent, together with a very benevolent letter, to the Emperor, who was then at Flushing, much occupied with the impending war with Russia. Although the Pope had conceded everything, Napoleon was not satisfied. He would not answer the letter, but made as though he had not received it, and sought a fresh reason for disagreement with his prisoner. Perhaps the Emperor was dissatisfied because the Pope would not completely and for all time resign his sovereignty over the Eternal City; he would no longer put up with the least resistance. When he returned from Moscow a conqueror, the Pope should sink down to be a court bishop, and the Emperor would be the Caliph of the West. At a later time he himself betrayed to us his own ideas.

On 16th August 1816 he was reading *Zaire* and some scenes of *Oedipe* after dinner with his fellow-sufferers at St

¹ Talleyrand II, 110.

² Documents in D'Haussonville V, 399f.

Helena, and the conversation turned upon Christianity and the Church. "What would have happened," he said, "if I had returned from Moscow victorious and triumphant? I should then finally have accomplished the separation of the spiritual from the temporal, which is so hurtful to His Holiness, while the mixing up of the two brings confusion into the community by the hand of the very person who ought to be the harmonious centre. I would then have exalted the Pope beyond all measure; I would have surrounded him with splendour and homage; I would have made him forget the loss of his temporal power; I would have made an idol of him (*une idole*). He should have taken up his residence near me; Paris would have been the capital of the Christian world, and I would have governed the world both of politics and of religion. It would have been a further means of uniting all the federal States of the empire and of maintaining peace. I would have held my religious assemblies side by side with the legislative ones. My councils would have been representative of Christendom, and the popes should only have been presidents of them. I would have opened and closed these assemblies, sanctioned and published their canons as did Constantine and Charles the Great. This supremacy has slipped out of the hands of the emperors because they made the mistake of letting the popes live at too great a distance from themselves." He said, moreover, that he had always thought it desirable that the religious leadership should be in the hands of the sovereign. "Without it one cannot rule; without it a nation will every moment be disturbed in its repose, its dignity, and its independence."¹

But it was not these ecclesiastical plans that most occupied his thoughts at the moment. The invasion of Russia concerned him more. Yet on the way to Moscow, the thought of being able one day to wield "the two swords" kept floating before him like a beautiful mirage. While he was receiving homage in the palace of Dresden from his imperial father-in-law, from kings and princes, his thoughts reverted to the prisoner at Savona. "I hear that English ships are in the neighbourhood of Savona," he wrote to Prince Borghese; "I think it will be necessary to convey the Pope into safety. You must therefore

¹ *Mémorial de Sainte-Hélène* V, 339f.

instruct the Prefect and the Commandant to see to it that the Pope is removed, together with his attendants, in two good carriages. The Pope must have the doctor in his carriage."¹ Once more, in the later part of the letter, he reminds Borghese that the carriage must be really good, and orders are given that the Pope shall travel in the usual black clerical garb, and that he must be taken through the towns by night in order to avoid a concourse. The destination of the journey was to be Fontainebleau, where he would be in the Emperor's neighbourhood.

The idea that the English had a plan for releasing the Pope was a creation of Napoleon's imagination. D'Haussonville in vain sought for traces of it in the Foreign Office, in the archives of the English Admiralty, and in the private papers of Croker, the Secretary of the Admiralty; he found nothing which could give the least ground for the Emperor's anxiety.² But Napoleon's orders were, of course, promptly obeyed. Pius VII. had to divest himself of his papal dress, and even to take off his shoes in order that the attendants might tear off the embroidered crosses and blacken them with ink; even the golden cross, which he wore about his neck, was taken from him. "It does not matter," he said; "everybody knows my face." On the journey he was taken ill, and a doctor, Claraz, had to be summoned. Claraz has left a written description of his meeting with the Pope, which shows that Claraz was threatened with death if he betrayed the name of his patient.³ After suffering great agony the unhappy Pope reached Fontainebleau on 16th June 1812, but not the smallest preparation had been made for his reception. He was no longer even allowed the triumph of being received by a group of faithful Catholics. At first he suffered so much that he could not bear to talk, and he spent the day in solitude; but afterwards he received numerous visits. The "red" cardinals and the bishops who were devoted to Napoleon were ordered to visit the Pope in order to induce him to make new and great sacrifices when the Emperor should return victorious.

¹ *Correspondance de Napoléon I.* XXIII, 18,710. Cp. Talleyrand: *Mémoires* II, 124.

² D'Haussonville V, 153f.

³ The manuscript is in the British Museum. See D'Haussonville V, 161f.

Fontainebleau was the last step on the way to Paris, and there the archiepiscopal palace, which then was situated near Nôtre Dame, was already being fitted up to receive the Pope. In a little guidebook of that time we still read of this palace: "Now the Pope's residence, and formerly the Archbishop's palace." But there was only small likelihood of inducing the Pope to go willingly to Paris; they could not persuade him to live differently at Fontainebleau from what he had done at Savona. He said Mass in a little room adjoining his bedroom, and he would not go either into the chapel or into the garden. He lived as sparingly as possible, and endeavoured to do everything for himself. The Duke of Rovigo even records that he mended his own clothes, and washed his own hands when they got black with snuff.¹ But the Duke is wrong when he tells us further that Pius VII. never read, though there was a good library in the palace.² Fontainebleau, which was filled with memories of Henry II. and Diana of Poitiers, Henry IV. and Gabrielle d'Estrées, perhaps did not contain books that were according to the taste of the Pope, but from other quarters he borrowed the writings of St Cyprian—and Van Espen's Canon Law.³

The news of the disastrous end of the Russian expedition was received by ecclesiastical circles in France as a judgment of God. When Pius VII. excommunicated Napoleon, the Emperor wrote to Eugène: "Does not the Pope know that the times have changed? Does anyone believe that excommunications will cause the weapons to fall out of my soldiers' hands?" "God," says Cardinal Pacca, "now permitted this to happen."⁴ It was indeed reported that "the soldiers could not keep a firm hold of their weapons; they slipped out of the hands even of the bravest." Pacca and many other faithful Catholics saw in the defeats upon the ice-fields of Russia a fulfilment of the Psalmist's words: "Fire and hail, snow and vapours, wind and storm, fulfilling His word." On 18th December 1812, Napoleon returned at midnight to the Tuileries, and he began immediately to repair his disasters by new conscriptions of soldiers. He perceived that a real or

¹ *Mémoires du Duc de Rovigo* (Paris 1828) VI, 72.

² D'Haussonville V, 175.

³ See above, p. 110.

⁴ Pacca II., 118.

feigned reconciliation with the Pope might be very useful under the circumstances, both with the Catholics of France and with those of Germany. But it was difficult for him to approach Pius VII. again. He had not answered the Pope's autograph letter, and he had since used violence against the Head of the Church. He seized the opening of the new year as the best opportunity for making fresh overtures to the Pope, and wrote a letter on 29th December to Pius VII. In this he expresses his pleasure at hearing that the Pope's health was better, and assures him of his friendship in spite of everything that has passed between them. "Perhaps," he says, "we may succeed in reaching the object so ardently desired, of ending all the differences between State and Church. I, for my part, am much inclined to it; it will depend upon Your Holiness."¹ Civility demanded that the Pope should acknowledge the letter with thanks. Cardinal Doria, the former nuncio in France, who was in the Emperor's good graces, was sent to Paris. During the Cardinal's short stay there, it was arranged to reopen negotiations, and some days later Duvoisin was sent to Fontainebleau with a fresh proposal that was to form the basis of a final agreement. Doria, Ruffo, and a few other cardinals and archbishops formed a sort of church commission to advise the Pope.

It might have been expected that Napoleon's new proposals would be more temperate than the former, but this was not the case. The same regard for credit in the world around, which makes a business man on the verge of bankruptcy display the utmost luxury, caused Napoleon to increase his demands at this critical moment. The Pope and his successors were to swear before their coronation neither to do nor to command anything contrary to the Gallican Propositions, and the Pope was only to have the right of appointing one-third of the College of Cardinals. With regard to the appointments of diocesan bishops, the last agreement was to continue in force. The Pope was to disapprove and condemn the conduct of those cardinals who would not be present at the Emperor's wedding, but the Emperor was to give them an amnesty; only Di Pietro and Pacca were to be exempted from it. The Pope

¹ *Correspondance de Napoléon I.* XXIV, 19,402. For what follows, cp. Pacca III, 63f.

was to live in Paris for the future, and to have 2,000,000 francs a year. This proposal again threw Pius VII. into the greatest anxiety. He did not sleep, and he grew so weak that Duvoisin was afraid of continuing to treat with him.

When Napoleon heard this, he determined to act on his own behalf. On 18th January he was hunting near Fontainebleau, and suddenly he betook himself to the palace in a post-chaise. In the evening, as the Pope sat in the midst of the cardinals and bishops and repeated anecdotes of Tivoli, and Imola, and Cesena, which wearied the listeners, but cheered the narrator,¹ Napoleon suddenly entered. All those present retired as quickly as possible, but Napoleon walked straight up to the Pope, embraced him, and kissed him. On that evening they did not discuss business, but Napoleon did all he could to show cordiality and friendliness. Pius VII. was delighted with this meeting, and told his attendants with rapture how the Emperor had embraced and kissed him; Pacca considers this to be evidence of the Pope's mental weakness.

In the following days took place those discussions between Emperor and Pope, about which so much has been written and so little is known. Chateaubriand, in his book *Bonaparte and the Bourbons*, narrates that Napoleon pulled the Pope by the hair and grossly insulted him. The Pope, however, according to Pacca, always denied this.² The only thing Pius VII. complained of was that Napoleon "had treated him as an ignoramus in ecclesiastical affairs." Napoleon, in his notes dictated at St Helena, passes over in silence the negotiations at Fontainebleau. But although we have no trustworthy account of the way in which the agreement was arrived at, we know the gist of it well. Bonaparte abated his demands considerably. In the Concordat which the Pope signed after many refusals and much inward trepidation, there is no mention of the Gallican Propositions, nor of the interference of the various States in the selection of cardinals. Nor was the Pope to be obliged to live in Paris, and important concessions were made as to the appointment of particular bishops in the neighbourhood of Rome and in France, although the regulations already agreed

¹ Pacca III, 115.

² With this also agrees De Pradt III, 5.

upon were in the main confirmed.¹ But in spite of all this complaisance the Pope felt but little inclination to sign. On the evening of 25th January, before signing it, he let his eyes travel round the circle that surrounded him; but most of them cast their eyes down or shrugged their shoulders, as a sign that there was nothing for it but to give way.² As soon as the Concordat was signed, an order was immediately given to recall the exiled cardinals and to release those in prison. Only over Pacca, according to the Pope, "a real battle was fought," "because," the Emperor said, "Pacca is my enemy." At length Napoleon gave way, and sent a courier to Turin to release this cardinal like the rest. On the same evening he dictated to Duvoisin a letter to Pius VII., in which he says that the Emperor has treated with him only in his capacity of ecclesiastic, and that the Pope by this Concordat has neither directly nor indirectly resigned his sovereignty over the Roman States.³ Was this intended for a kindness, or as a sarcasm?

Immediately after the Concordat of Fontainebleau was concluded, *Te Deum* was sung in all churches, and the agreement between the Emperor and the Pope was officially notified to the authorities in Milan and in Rome. Napoleon remained three more days at Fontainebleau, but then returned to Paris to arrange a new campaign. After his departure the cardinals gathered round their aged sovereign, and both Pacca and Consalvi were provided with rooms in the immediate neighbourhood of the Pope. They found Pius pale and thin, with sunken eyes; he had no peace of mind, he could eat nothing; and he said: "I am dying mad, like Clement XIV." Pacca, who knew how difficult Napoleon's position then was, consoled him by saying that everything might still turn out well, but the unfortunate Pope, who had not had the opportunity of following the course of events in the world, would not be comforted.

He immediately placed each article of the Concordat before

¹ The Concordat is printed in *Correspondance de Napoléon I.* XXIV, 45of. Cp. Talleyrand II, 117f.

² Pacca III, 66.

³ The letter, which is not printed in the large collection, is found among the documents in D'Haussonville V, 530, and Pacca III, 72f. D'Haussonville says, p. 228: "Il est assez difficile de deviner si elle était dictée par une intention gracieuse ou si elle contenait un sarcasme amer contre le saint-père." Pacca (III, 73) regards it as a new and offensive mockery.

the cardinals in order to hear their opinion about it; the deliberation which then took place was no easy matter. "We had," says Pacca, "to make this examination away from Rome; we lived in one of Napoleon's palaces, surrounded by his ministers and servants; we had to meet in all secrecy to avoid giving occasion to think that we were intriguing. The Sacred College was divided into the 'black' and the 'red' cardinals, and I found reason to believe that to some of them might be applied Tertullian's saying about those shepherds, who in time of peace are lions, and deer in time of strife." Some of the cardinals proposed that the Concordat should immediately be recalled, but this proposal met with great resistance from others; for how could such a proceeding be reconciled with the Pope's infallibility.¹ This view triumphed, nevertheless; and Consalvi informed Pius VII. that the feeling of the majority of the cardinals was overwhelmingly in favour of recall. Consalvi therefore made a draft of such a document, and the Pope copied it out. Every morning Di Pietro and Consalvi brought the paper to him that he might write out a little of it, and in the afternoon Pacca took it away, hiding it under his clothes, for it was not safe to leave it in the Pope's apartments where everything was examined. Pacca relates, that in spite of the winter cold he sometimes sweated for fear, when he passed the sentinels with the important document hidden under his clothes.

The copy was finished on 24th March, and the document was then sent to the Emperor. Pius VII. confesses in it that since he signed the Concordat, he has been tormented with qualms of conscience and with penitence, so that he has had no peace nor rest. He regrets the offence he has thereby given to the Church; and as Paschal II. in his time recalled the concessions made by him to Henry V., so now he recalls his.² After the despatch of this letter Pius VII. regained his peace of mind, and was able to eat and sleep. But the cardinals were in great suspense, not knowing how Napoleon would

¹ Pacca says (III, 77) that many of the cardinals (both of the red and of the black) at that time used the following argument: "How can you Italians reconcile this great mistake, this papal downfall, with the doctrine of the infallibility of the Head of the Roman Church?"

² Pacca III, 83f. Talleyrand II, 119f. Chaptal, 245.

receive the notice of the repudiation of the Concordat, and the news which reached them was not favourable. When he mentioned the matter to his Council of State, he is reported to have said: "This will never be settled, unless I cut off the heads of some of those priests at Fontainebleau." But when one of the members of the Council invited him to declare himself Head of the French Church, he said: "No, that would be to break the windows." He chose another way. On the following day he wrote to the Minister of Public Worship: "You must observe the strictest secrecy with regard to the Pope's letter of 24th March, so that I can, according to circumstances, say either that I have received it, or that I have not."¹ The bishops were to be sent home "on account of Holy Week" and of their duties, but the Concordat of Fontainebleau was to remain the law of the State in spite of the Pope's withdrawal. The bishops, moreover, were to be kept in ignorance of the withdrawal, and were to sign an address of which Napoleon himself supplied the draft. In this the Concordat is called an inspiration of the Holy Ghost to bring to an end the misfortunes of the Church. The Emperor took the matter into his own hands and directed it, as if it were the only thing he had to do, although at the same time he was engaged in re-organising his army.

Maury was sent out to Fontainebleau in order to get the Pope and his counsellors to change their opinion; but Maury's eloquence was wasted. He was in disgrace with the Pope, and remained so.² The Emperor then had recourse to strong measures; Di Pietro was imprisoned, and others than the cardinals were forbidden to be present at the Pope's Mass. These were ordered not to interfere in anything, "that they might at least not disturb the affairs of the State, since they would not put the Church's concerns in order." After this Napoleon set out for the army, but he issued one order after another to use violent measures towards the clergy, and the Pope remained a prisoner. At Dresden Napoleon received a letter from his faithful servant Bishop Duvoisin. The letter was written on the bishop's death-bed, and contained the

¹ Printed among the documents in D'Haussonville V, 532f., but not in the official edition.

² Maury II, 433f.

following words: "I implore you to liberate the Holy Father. His imprisonment darkens the last moments of my life. I have several times had the honour of telling you how this captivity pains the whole of Christendom, and what difficulties arise from its prolongation. I believe that the Holy Father's return to Rome will be necessary for your happiness."¹ Napoleon ordered a monument to be erected in memory of the deceased bishop in the cathedral at Nantes, but he did not fulfil the last wish of his dying servant. After the successful sortie from Dresden he dreamt once more dreams of victory.

But fortune had deserted him, and instead of being able, as a conqueror, to employ menaces and violence against the ministers of the Church, he was compelled to request the priests, as a defeated commander surrounded on every side by enemies, to pray for the country, the army, and the Emperor. This request was no doubt complied with in most places, but the breach between the Emperor and the Pope could not be healed. On 9th May 1813 Pius VII. had declared all the bishops recently installed to be unlawful, intruded pastors, and their official acts to be invalid, and on this point he was inflexible.

A new advance on the Emperor's part did not lead to any result; even the cardinals had now lost their faith in Napoleon's sincerity. On 22nd January 1814 a colonel of gendarmes, Lagorsse, who had taken a part in the last negotiations with the Pope, appeared at Fontainebleau with three empty carriages, and he told the cardinals the great news that he had received orders to take Pius VII. back to Rome. In reality the Pope was not to be taken further than Savona, and the journey was, according to Napoleon's orders, to be made slowly, and along byeways.² The cardinals advised the Pope to ask that two or three members of the Sacred College should accompany him. This request was not fulfilled, and it soon became evident to everybody that Pius VII. was only to be removed in order to be further away from the theatre of war, and so in greater security.

On 23rd January Pius VII., after hearing Mass at Fontainebleau, took leave of the cardinals, whom he admonished to show loyalty to the Papacy and firmness against all temptations on the part of the temporal power.

¹ D'Haussonville V, 288f.

² *Ibid.*, 318f.

At the end of February he reached Savona by way of Limoges, Montauban, and Montpellier. At Savona he was received by a new prefect, the Marquis de Brignole, who treated him more as a sovereign than as a prisoner, and on 17th March Brignole announced to him that he was free, and might leave the next day if he pleased. "I will not go to-morrow," answered Pius VII., "for it is the Festival of Our Lady, the patroness of this town. To-morrow I will say Mass in your church." He did not leave Savona until 19th March, four days before the Allied Powers at the castle of Dampierre in Champagne decided to advance upon Paris.

A week after the Pope's departure from Fontainebleau, the cardinals were also ordered to leave in different sets, and at different times, for places which Napoleon would specify. The Imperial exchequer was then at so low an ebb that the prelates themselves had to defray the expenses of the journey, and even to pay the police escort which was to look after them. At Béziers Consalvi received the news of Napoleon's abdication, and he immediately demanded a passport from the under-prefect. As this was refused, he produced his red cardinal's cap, and said that this would serve as a passport if the prefect persisted in refusing to give him one. On his journey Consalvi had to spend the night in a little house close to Fréjus, because the post-horses were being kept ready for the Emperor. The next morning, as Napoleon drove by, Consalvi stood on a piece of rising ground by the roadside. The Emperor immediately recognised the papal diplomatist, and said to Field-Marshal von Keller, who sat beside him, and who wished to know Napoleon's opinion of Consalvi: "He is a man who does not wish to appear to be a priest, but he is more of a priest than all the rest of them."¹ This was the last meeting between the two great men. Consalvi continued his journey southward, and at Imola he met Pius VII., who again appointed him to the Secretaryship of State, but at the same time ordered him to proceed instantly to Paris to negotiate with the Allied Powers.

As we now approach the end of Napoleon's long strife with the Pope, the cardinals, and the bishops, it seems reasonable to ask what effect this strife had upon the Emperor's own religious views. One who knew him well has hazarded the opinion that

¹ Bartholdy, 55.

his original deism and fatalism would in the course of time have developed into real devotion to the Church, if this strife had not arisen.¹ But on account of his controversy with the Church the development took an entirely different course. In dealing with so many bishops and cardinals, and by reading the controversial writings of the Gallicans and the Ultramontanes, Napoleon learnt that the Church of Rome no less than the Protestant section of the Church contains great differences within itself. He is reported to have said that each Catholic priest has in reality his own religion. "The Pope's is different from that of the cardinals, and these do not agree among themselves in religious matters. The principles of the Archbishop of Tours do not agree with those of the Bishop of Nantes, nor his with those of the Bishop of Evreux." From this he concluded that there was nothing fixed in religion. Like several of the great Ghibellines of the Middle Ages, he came out of the conflict with the Church a shipwrecked man as regards religion.

But he had learnt one thing. It was that there lay in the Papacy a power of resistance of a special nature and of a peculiar strength. A few days had sometimes been sufficient to make mighty sovereigns give way on every point; but the Emperor had never been able to bend the weak pontiff. While Pius VII. was a prisoner at Savona and everything seemed lost to the Chair of St Peter, Napoleon learned, as he said to Count Chaptal, "that the power that rules over souls has a greater sway than that which rules over bodies."²

¹ "Si ses démêlés avec le Pape ne fussent pas survenus, je ne doute pas qu'à quarante cinq ans il n'eût été dévot."—Chaptal, 239.

² Chaptal, 244.

CHAPTER XIII

RESTORATION AND REACTION

THE Pope's journey to Rome was a triumphal progress; the people fell on their knees before him, and the princes did homage to him. In his native town of Cesena he was met by Murat, who had deserted Napoleon and joined the Allied Powers. Murat's troops had occupied Rome and the Papal States, and he himself came to Cesena, not only to pay homage to the Pope, but also to be recognised as King of Naples. When Pius VII. told him that the rights of the Papacy over Naples must first be acknowledged, the Neapolitan ministers advised their King to promise the white courser; but Murat rejected the advice as derogatory to his honour.¹ Before the Porta del Popolo, which Pius VII. reached on 24th May, Carlos IV. of Spain greeted the returning Pope; and the crowd unharnessed the horses of his carriage, in which the Dean of the College of Cardinals, Mattei, and Cardinal Pacca, were seated, and thirty young men of the best Roman families dragged it to St Peter's.² Amidst the enthusiastic shouts of the crowd Pius VII. mounted the steps of the church, and in the church Charles Emanuel IV. of Sardinia kissed his foot. At the Quirinal Queen Marie Louise of Etruria awaited his coming.

Pius VII. was the one who had suffered most at the hands of Napoleon; therefore he was made a hero of by the sovereigns, who were rejoicing to be able to shake off the French yoke. But there was also a deeper cause for the homage paid to the successor of St Peter; it was paid not to the martyr only but also to the Head of the Church. The sovereigns of Europe were glad at the quelling of the Revolution, and since the

¹ Coppi: *Annali d'Italia* (Roma 1827) IV, 282f.

² Artaud II, 372, 379f.

Revolution was in its inner nature anti-religious, the Restoration bore from the beginning a religious and ecclesiastical impress, and the Pope was extolled as the representative of religious interests, even by Protestants.¹ The bloody drama enacted in France had taught the sovereigns how easily thrones could follow altars to their ruin, and "the throne upon the altar" became the watchword of the Restoration. Instead of the revolutionary triad, "liberty, equality, fraternity," the reaction set up *foi, roi, loi*. To a certain extent Napoleon himself helped to inaugurate the Restoration; his coronation and the institution of the new French nobility was the first expression of that return towards the Middle Ages and what belonged to them, which was so marked in the period following 1814.

But the attempt to reintroduce the faith of the Middle Ages was not more sincere in the case of many sovereigns than Napoleon's solicitude for the Church. It was outwardly politics, and inwardly a matter of police, that made many hark back to the altars. They wished to infuse into the people "a spirit of bondage again to fear"; therefore the new period became the blossoming season of Ultramontanism. Gallicanism, Febronianism, and all freer movements within the Roman Church were stopped. The portion of the Middle Ages, which Rome herself wished to revive, was not the time of Valdes, Wycliffe, and Hus, not the time of the proud metropolitans, the mighty Ghibellines, and the great Councils, but the days of Innocent III., when the whole of Christendom listened to the words that proceeded from the see of St Peter. And in Rome people saw with happy wonder that the Papacy was becoming a necessary factor in many of the systems of the reactionary theorists.

Thus when Schlegel sought in the past a remedy for the future, he halted at the empire, the Papacy, and the orders of chivalry, but it was the empire of Charles the Great and of the Ottos that he wished to restore, before the battle between the Guelphs and the Ghibellines. The ideal for the European system of states and nationalities should be a harmonious co-operation between Empire and Papacy as in the days of

¹ How far Protestants could go in their homage to the Papacy can be seen from the letters collected in the introduction to the *Mémoires* of Consalvi. The letters from Protestant statesmen are, as a rule, far more "dévotés" than those of Catholics.

Otto III. and Sylvester II. De Maistre expressed still more clearly the dawning apotheosis of the Papacy. To him the Papacy was the one essential thing in religion, the only help against "the constitutional fever." The Pope was to be an umpire who should put an end to all strife; he was to be above princes and peoples alike, and infallibility was to be in the spiritual world the same thing as the sovereignty in the temporal world.

And Pius VII., during the controversy with Napoleon, had developed into a pope after the heart of the Romanticists. His moral character had shown itself to be more marked than his intellectual powers, and he was stronger in the passive than in the active virtues; his courage was the suffering type of courage, and the martyr's crown suited him better than the triple tiara. If Napoleon had been face to face with a personality like Gregory VII. or Alexander III., all the scenes in the drama would have had quite another character, from the prelude of the coronation to the Concordat at Fontainebleau. In dealing with a dove like Pius VII. the imperial eagle often seemed only a common hawk; and there was more of a Celestine V. than of a Boniface VIII. in the meek *peregrinus Apostolicus*. In his inmost heart Pius VII. was a quiet monk, who was more at home in a cell and a convent garden than in the *salons* of the Louvre or in the Champs Elysées.

But at his side he had a statesman who was soon to prove himself a match for the other statesmen of the Restoration. This time it was the Guelph, who had with him a Peter de la Vigne. Dante in his *Divina Commedia* makes the great minister of Frederic II. of Hohenstaufen say that he possessed both the keys of his sovereign's heart, and that he understood how to open and to shut sweetly, as he turned them.¹ In these words the Romans saw a description of the relation between Pius VII. and his Secretary of State.

But circumstances compelled Pius to send his Peter de la Vigne for a while to Paris and Vienna to watch over the political interests of the Papal See, and during his absence Bartolommeo Pacca, who had been appointed Cardinal Camerlengo, occupied the post of Papal Secretary of State. Pacca was a counsellor of another stamp. Consalvi was in many

¹ *Inferno* XIII, 58.

respects a man of modern sympathy and intelligence, who saw the various statesmen working for the consolidation of their states upon a conservative basis, without jealously watching over the supposed sovereignty of the Church with the Bull *Unam Sanctam* always in his mind. Pacca, on the other hand, who had given German Febronianism its death-blow, was entirely possessed with mediæval ideals, and the Jesuit policy was his policy. Pius VII. admired in Consalvi a political breadth of view and a diplomatic skill which he did not himself possess; in Pacca he could rejoice over a consistent prosecution of that statecraft which was born within the monastery walls, and which looked upon everything through a church window.

Before Pius VII. made his entry into his capital, Cardinal Rivarola as legate *a latere* had already endeavoured to put everything in Rome on the old footing. What he had begun was continued by Pacca, and he began at the right end from the point of view of the Restoration and the Counter-Revolution. He had already proposed in his daily conversations with the Pope at Fontainebleau the restoration of the Jesuit order.¹ Pius had been doubtful. He was a Benedictine, and the teachers of his youth had been opposed to the Jesuits; "and it is well known," says Pacca, "what an impression that which we learn in our youth makes upon us." But the destroyer of Febronianism did not give up the idea for lost. He had himself been brought up on Pascal's Provincial Letters and Arnauld's book on the practical morals of the Jesuits; but these early impressions he counted among the sins of his youth. Only with the assistance of the revived order of the Jesuits would it be possible, in his opinion, for the Papacy to crush the hydra of the Revolution.

We have already seen that the spirit of Jesuitism had found an asylum with Alfonso Maria de' Liguori's congregation of the Redemptorists, and that in Prussia and Russia, thanks to Frederick II. and Catherine II., "Jesuit seed" had been preserved until better times should come. Something more had likewise happened. In 1794 the ex-Jesuit de Broglie, son of the Marshal, together with the Abbés de Tournely and Pey of Louvain, had formed "a Society of the Sacred Heart of Jesus," which was to be a substitute for the

¹ Pacca III, 116f.

dissolved order.¹ The advance of the French army compelled the little society to flee from Louvain to Augsburg, and from thence to Passau and Vienna. In Austria "the Society of the Sacred Heart of Jesus" gained many friends, amongst others the Archduchess Marie Anna, who enabled it to open a school at Hagenbrunn and a house for novices at Prague; but at the close of the century it was united at the Pope's bidding to the so-called "Paccanarists" or "fathers of the faith of Jesus."²

There was a tradition in Italy and Spain, that if Loyola's order was ever to be restored, it would not be done by a king, but by a soldier or a man of the people. Niccolò Paccanari was such a man. He was a tanner of Trent, who had been a soldier in the Pope's army, but had forsaken his warlike occupation in order to live a life of penitence. He and a few more young men of the people had taken care of a dozen or so of the seminarists who had been turned out of the palace of the Propaganda after the French occupation of Rome. The religious and enthusiastic youths were soon noticed by the revolutionary party, and were imprisoned in the castle of Sant' Angelo. In the room where these young men were confined Lorenzo Ricci had breathed his last, and the young prisoners, who had the deepest veneration for Loyola's order, there formed the plan of restoring the dissolved order themselves. After their release they retired to a secluded spot near Spoleto, and chose Paccanari as their Superior. They put themselves into communication with Pius VI. while he was at Val d'Ema, and obtained of him leave to hold missions, after the manner of the Jesuits, and in all essentials to follow the Jesuit rule, while they called themselves "the fathers of the faith of Jesus" (*Compagnia della fede di Gesù*). The ex-Jesuits looked with jealousy upon this imitation of their order, but at Padua, where the fathers of the faith of Jesus had their house for novices, many young men in sympathy with the Jesuits gathered together, and this society, which was augmented by the members of "the Society of the Sacred Heart of Jesus," became a nursery for Loyola's order. When the Society of Jesus was restored, not a few of the fathers of the faith of Jesus sought admis-

¹ Crétineau-Joly: *Histoire de la compagnie de Jésus* V, 418f., and Zöckler (Steitz) in Hauck-Herzog VIII, 774f., and XIV, 547f.

² *Mémoires du Cardinal Maury* I, 237f., and Louis XVIII.'s letter, 244f.

sion into it, and by order of the Pope were let off with only one year's novitiate.

But besides these off-shoots, there were also true branches on the old stem. On 7th March 1801 Pius VII., at the instance of the Emperor Paul I., had re-established the order of Loyola in the Russian Empire, by the brief *Catholicæ fidei*,¹ which is addressed to the Superior of the Russian Jesuits Franz Karev. It was the peculiar situation in Russia which induced him to do this; and it was only to hold good in Russia (*intra tamen Rossiaci imperii fines dumtaxat et non extra*). His reasons for this step were solicitude for the training of priests, and the fact that the harvest was great but the labourers few. On 30th July 1804 in a new brief addressed to the superior and "*præses generalis*," Gabriel Gruber, Karev's successor, he had re-established the order for the kingdom of the Two Sicilies, again at the instigation of the temporal ruler, King Ferdinand.² It was, perhaps, only the great controversy with Napoleon, that hindered the complete restoration of the order a few years after. In the house at the Gesù in Rome a band of Jesuits continued to live; they consisted chiefly of returned missionaries, they laboured in the cure of souls, and in preaching; and several seminaries were under their control.³ From this centre proceeded continual demands to make good the error of Clement XIV., and Cardinal Pacca made himself the interpreter of these desires.

By the two Bulls above-mentioned, Pius VII. had taken such a decisive step towards re-establishment of the order, that the logic of events was bound to compel him, sooner or later, to accede to Pacca's wish. He knew beforehand, as he said in a letter to Consalvi, that the re-establishment would put the philosophical and Jansenist clique in a bad humour; but in their displeasure he saw the best evidence that the order ought to be restored.⁴ Nor was much opposition to be expected from the leading statesmen. The disciples of Ignatius Loyola had in past times stood sponsors for political autocracy; therefore Conservative politicians looked upon them as champions of the

¹ Printed in *Bullarium Romanum* XI, 106f., and in Sanguinetti: *La compagnie de Jésus*, 38of. Cp. Tolstoy: *Romanism in Russia* II, 43f.

² *Bullarium Romanum* XI, and Sanguinetti, 385f.

³ J. Huber: *Der Jesuitenorden* (Berlin 1873), 560.

⁴ Consalvi: *Mémoires* I, 88.

throne as well as of the altar. Amongst Metternich's papers there is an interesting memorandum,¹ written in 1825, which shows how this statesman looked upon the much-contested order. He is full of admiration for Saint Ignatius, who with "a truly Christian outlook," formed his order as a protection for the Head of the Church. But he distinguishes between the original order and that "Jesuitism" which had so greatly degenerated in the eighteenth century, and which would undoubtedly have been compelled by the governments to return to its original purity, if the philosophical spirit of the century had not demolished the order altogether. Metternich entirely approves of the original aim of the order: "the maintenance of the Church and the Throne, and the victory of both over their opponents." The "passionate persecution and endless bitterness," which all revolutionary spirits, from the religious Reformers down to the lowest Radical, had displayed towards the Society of Jesus, was to him a sure sign that the Jesuits had not abandoned their original task. From that side, therefore, there was no need to expect serious objections to the restoration, even if such a step should be hailed both with astonishment, and with ill-will, by certain circles in the Austrian capital.

On 7th August 1814 Pius VII. entered the Jesuit church at Rome in solemn procession, and said Mass at the altar of Ignatius. He then caused the Bull *Sollicitudo omnium* to be read in the adjoining oratory before a numerous congregation of cardinals, bishops, and Neapolitan and Sicilian Jesuits. The Pope says in that Bull that the care of the Church committed to his charge imposes upon him the duty of meeting the spiritual needs of Christendom by all the means in his power. Since the re-establishment of the Society of Jesus in Russia and in the kingdom of the Two Sicilies by the briefs of 7th March 1801, and of 30th July 1804, the unanimous wishes of nearly the whole of Christendom had called forth urgent and strong appeals to restore the order, especially since the activities of the Society had borne abundance of fruit in the countries where it had been at work. The Pope would therefore be guilty of a grave sin against God, if, amidst the heavy storms that raged around the ship of St Peter, he were to reject the

¹ *Nachgelassene Papiere* II, 2, 228f.

strong and experienced navigators who offered themselves to cleave a way through the seething billows. For that reason he had determined to carry out what had been his warmest wish since he ascended the throne of St Peter, and he now gave command by the present irrevocable decree, that the former permissions issued for Russia and the Sicilies should from this moment be extended to all parts of the Papal States, and to all states and kingdoms. This decision, it is said, is to be for all time abiding and inviolable; every action contrary to it, from whomsoever it emanates, shall be invalid and ineffectual, and in particular the brief of Clement XIV. is by these presents made null and void, and deprived of all efficacy.¹

Pacca says, that it is impossible to describe the joyful shouts of the good Romans, and the acclamations which greeted the Pope on his way to and from the church of the Jesuits.² But he is not an entirely impartial witness in this matter, and we know that Consalvi and others with him had great misgivings.³ It seemed to many to be premature to restore the order wholly to its former status, and there were Conservative cardinals who thought it exceedingly improper for one pope to restore an order which another pope had dissolved for ever. But the revived order made its way quickly in most places. Ferdinand VII. of Spain, immediately after the Restoration, resolved to support his tottering throne by means of the Jesuits, although De la Huerta, the financial minister, was the only member of the regular Conservative Castilian council who pleaded their cause.⁴ To strengthen the Spanish king in his intention Pius VII. sent him a letter on 15th December 1814,⁵ warmly commending the order, and on 29th May 1815 such Spanish laws as were a hindrance to the return of the Jesuits were repealed, so that Loyola's order quickly came into possession of great riches and regained their old power in the confessional and in the schools. In Piedmont the Jesuits had a faithful friend in Charles Emanuel, the brother of Victor Emanuel I., who at the beginning of 1815 became a Jesuit novice;⁶ and there also

¹ *Bullarium Romanum* XIII, 323f. Cp. Sanguinetti, 170f.

² Pacca III, 117.

³ Bartholdy, 69.

⁴ Gervinus: *Geschichte des XIXten Jahrhunderts* (Leipzig 1856) II, 24.

⁵ Printed in Sanguinetti, 194f.

⁶ Crétineau-Joly: *Histoire de la compagnie de Jésus* VI, 46f.

they soon became, by favour of the King and of the nobility, masters of the universities and in the schools, and obtained great influence over the government and the tribunals.¹ In 1816 they came to Vienna, and in 1818 by the help of the Bishop of Geneva and Lausanne they obtained a stronghold at Fribourg, from which they could work other places in Switzerland.²

But from Portugal and Brazil came a strong protest against the restoration of the order,³ and in France great difficulties were in store for it. The "fathers of the faith" had there prepared the way for the order, and as most of the members of this congregation had been incorporated with the disciples of Loyola,⁴ the latter took courage and founded a house for the professed at Montrouge.⁵ Lamennais greeted their efforts with joy, being convinced that they alone could revive religion in France, but Gallicanism and Jansenism again and again entered into conflict with them.⁶ In Russia Jesuitism had a great admirer in another of "the prophets of the past," the Sardinian representative in St Petersburg, De Maistre, who looked upon the order as one of the best instruments for promoting enlightenment and civilisation.⁷ But they lost the asylum which Catherine II. and Paul I. had granted them, because their propaganda, becoming bolder and bolder after the restoration of the order, began to frighten the Orthodox rulers of Russia. On 16th December 1815 they were banished from the two Russian capitals,⁸ and on 13th March 1820 they were expelled from the whole of Russia and Poland.⁹ The exiled Russian and Polish Jesuits found an asylum in Galicia, where the Dominican convent at Tarnopol was granted to them. At first, it was desired that they should break off connexion with Rome, and choose a vicar-general for the Austrian province

¹ Gervinus II, 21f.

² Gams: *Geschichte der Kirche Christi im XIXten Jahrhundert* II, 326f.

³ Cp. the Marquis da Aguiar's note of 1st April 1815 in Paulus: *Sophronizon* (Frankfurt 1819) IV, 53f.

⁴ See above, p. 344.

⁵ A. Lirac: *Les Jésuites et la liberté religieuse sous la restauration* (Paris 1879) and Nielsen's *Romerkirken i det 19de Hundredaar. Det indre Liv* I, 142f.

⁶ Nielsen: *op. cit.* I, 182f., 198f.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 36f.

⁸ The Ukase is partly given in Tolstoy: *Romanism in Russia* II, 118.

⁹ Tolstoy II, 126f.

independent of the General of the order, and should at the same time subject themselves to certain restrictions; but after they had pointed out to the government, in an application drawn up with true Jesuit dialectic, that the demands made upon them were not conformable to the statutes of their order, they were allowed to live as their statutes directed.¹

As soon as the Jesuits, who had been driven out like dogs, had returned according to the old prophecy like eagles, fanaticism, superstition, and Ultramontanism found in them a ready army, and reaction all round broke forth under Pacca's administration of the Papal States. All the laws of the French period were immediately cancelled by Cardinal Rivarola, and the Canon Law and the Papal Constitutions were again put in force.² Every improvement which the French had introduced into Rome was got rid of, from the lighting of the streets to vaccination. Begging was again allowed, and the images of the Madonna began again to roll their eyes. The Jesuits once more got the schools into their hands, and Latin thereby obtained an overwhelming importance in education.³ The Inquisition was restored. At the beginning of 1815 there were already 737 prosecutions for heresy in progress, and in 1816 the Inquisitor at Ravenna condemned a converted but renegade Jew to death.⁴ The Congregation of the Index went to work and extended its operations to political and poetical writings, so that at length several of Alfieri's poetical works (January 1823) came to be on the list of prohibited books.⁵ Cardinal della Genga, the successor of Pius VII. in the chair of St Peter, who was then vicar-general at Rome, forbade the Roman priests to wear an overcoat as laymen did; and every Saturday at least 300 Jews from the Ghetto had to go to church to listen to a sermon intended to convert them; Della Genga even thought of closing the gates of the Ghetto every evening.⁶ The monasteries were opened once more; an edict of 15th August 1814 re-established at

¹ Metternich: *Nachgelassene Papiere* II, 228f.

² Coppi: *Annali d'Italia* IV, 284. Cp. Döllinger: *Kirche und Kirchen* (München 1861), 552f.

³ G. Pasolini: *Memorie* (Torino 1887), 29.

⁴ Gervinus II, 17, 23.

⁵ *Index librorum prohibitorum* (Roma 1881), 7. Cp. Reusch: *Index* II, 1018.

⁶ Ranke: *Hist.-biogr. Studien*, 109f.

one stroke 1,824 convents for monks and 612 for nuns.¹ The sale of church property was stopped, and the demand was made that those, who during the French occupation had bought anything belonging to the Church, should restore what they had bought. The Dominican *Magister Palatii*, Anfossi, even wrote a pamphlet in which he maintained that those who did not return such acquisitions would forfeit eternal salvation.² As long as Consalvi had any influence, Anfossi's work was not allowed to see the light, but it shows what were the ruling thoughts in *Zelanti* circles immediately after the Restoration began. It was Pacca's desire to force everything back, not only to the time before 1789, but even to the time before 1773.

While Pacca was doing his best to spread the gloom and darkness of the Middle Ages over the Eternal City, Consalvi was travelling in foreign lands.³ When he arrived in Paris in May, all the allied princes and diplomatists had left, or were about to leave, for London; Consalvi did not hesitate to follow them, especially as he bore an introduction from Pius VII. to the Prince Regent. But when he was about to set foot on English soil, he was perplexed. Durst he show himself in his cardinal's dress in England, where no cardinal had been received for a couple of hundred years, and where the people not long before had burned the Pope himself in effigy? He solved the question by putting on the black coat and white neckcloth of an English clergyman, and he met with no violence. The English were then so kindly disposed towards all the enemies of Napoleon that the Pope's minister could show himself everywhere without let or hindrance, and at a public banquet the English drank to the health of Pius VII. without any objection being made.⁴ Consalvi had even in 1800 the reputation amongst Englishmen of being a "very gentlemanly liberal man,"⁵ and he maintained his reputation. Through him a closer connexion was begun between the

¹ Gervinus II, 17.

² C. C. J. *Freiherr von Bunsen, geschildert von seiner Witwe* (Leipzig 1868) I, 244.

³ Bartholdy, 56f.

⁴ Bunsen I, 247f.

⁵ Castlereagh *Memoirs* (London 1849) III, 384.

Papacy and England, where the Roman propaganda was afterwards to obtain so much success.¹

From London Consalvi travelled to the Congress at Vienna. The diplomatists who gathered there were not unwilling to listen to the wishes of Rome. They had learnt, as Talleyrand explained to Louis XVIII. in 1815 on the way from Ghent to Paris, that the old belief that sovereignty is an emanation of Deity had lost its hold, as well as the belief that certain families were to reign in the strength of divine right. "Nowadays," said Talleyrand, "the general opinion is that that is the legitimate power, which can best secure for the nations peace and happiness, and which has existed for a long period of years, and so has many associations connected with it."² From this point of view, which was held by many of the statesmen assembled at Vienna, the Papacy could certainly reckon upon a prominent place, and those who were the upholders of legitimacy bowed reverently before a ruling dynasty which traced its genealogy back to St Peter, and which possessed the rich associations of Rome.

Italy had sent but few representatives to the Austrian capital. That beautiful country was looked upon as a conquered province, which was at the disposal of the Allied Powers. It was only a "geographical expression" to most statesmen. The only man who really took an interest in the peninsula was Count Capodistrias, the representative of Russia, and that was only because he was a Philhellenist. Greece and Italy were to him two noble sisters, sunk in the sleep of death; "let the one sister awake, and the other would also be released from her magic slumber."³

Fortunately for the Papacy, Pius VII. had a statesman in Consalvi, who possessed all the qualifications necessary for bringing the cause of the Papal States to the desired end. As the Pope's Legate, he took precedence, according to old

¹ In Castlereagh's *Correspondence, Despatches, and other papers* (London 1852) XII, 239, is to be seen a despatch from Consalvi of 7th April 1820. At the bottom of the despatch there is a request to turn over the leaf, and when this is done we read confidential communications, which show that Consalvi played a part in the affair between George IV. and Queen Caroline. Cp. Wiseman, 204.

² Talleyrand III, 218.

³ Words of Rossi, quoted in H. Reuchlin: *Geschichte Italiens* (Leipzig 1859) I, 60.

custom, of all the other ambassadors, and this was conceded without objection even by the sovereigns who were not in communion with Rome.¹ At first, however, his influence does not seem to have been great. He was considered to be *insinuant comme un parfum*, and his zeal and perseverance were admired,² but it took some time before his most eminent qualities were observed. Meanwhile, he was soon initiated into all secrets, and the English, German, and Russian diplomatists seem to have been especially intimate with him.³ We have, from Consalvi's own hand, an account of a confidential meeting, which throws light on the temper of the Congress. In a fragment of a note written at the end of 1814 or the beginning of 1815, we hear that he had a long conversation one day, with Prince Hardenberg, Count Nesselrode, and Lord Castlereagh. "I came away from the conversation much troubled," he writes. "Prince Hardenberg and Lord Castlereagh admit in confidential conversation, that they have no confidence in the arrangements which we are making here. People think they can crush out the Revolution by suppressing or silencing it; but it penetrates into the very midst of the Congress through all the crevices that are opened for it. An able and far-seeing policy has never allowed itself to give nations new rulers, new laws, manners, and customs, every half century. Laws are a bridle to which the human mouth must get accustomed little by little. The yoke which a happy obedience imposes must pass from one generation of a family to another, more as a reminiscence of fatherly protection, than as a sign of servitude. The French Revolution represents princes as tyrants, and abhors the holy and venerable traditions of the past. Its mission is to hew everything down with the stroke of the axe, and to introduce everything new with cannon shots. It is a new form of despotism inaugurated in the name of liberty, and this new form will be more disastrous both for people and for princes, because it brings defeats and misfortunes without

¹ Klüber: *Acten des Wiener-Congresses in den Jahren 1814 und 1815* (Erlangen 1815) IV, 314.

² Thus the Marquis San Marzano in a despatch of 28th December 1814: see N. Bianchi: *Storia documentata della diplomazia Europea in Italia* (Torino 1865) I, 407.

³ Artaud II, 423, and the letters in the first vol. of Consalvi's *Memoirs*.

number as the result of blindness and arrogance. When I think of them I am absolutely in despair. We are engaged here in propping up an old hovel with money and might; but we do not think of erecting a new, solid house, although it would probably cost less and would certainly be more durable."¹ The three ambassadors understood Consalvi's anxiety well, but the troublous times and modern ways of thought made it, in their opinion, impossible to build the solid house. The great misfortune of the negotiations at the Congress seemed to Consalvi to be the want of mutual understanding between those present; they only understood one another when two were together at a time in this ecumenical council of monarchy. "We are like the builders of the Tower of Babel," he says; "our tongues become confounded the very moment we lay the first stone of the foundation." The conversation shows that Consalvi was a Conservative of the purest water. From his point of view he was also an enemy of the liberty of the Press. When he was in Paris, he had expressed to Louis XVIII. his dissatisfaction with the recently published Charter, and said that the liberty of the Press was the most dangerous weapon which had ever been placed in the hands of the opponents of religion and of monarchy. It would be extended at every public crisis, and with every social disturbance; and he foresaw that the despotism of the Press would more and more be exercised by unknown men or by persons of bad character.²

When the case of the Papacy itself came before the Congress, Consalvi had to use all his skill as a statesman to ward off the threatening perils. Some days before the peace of Paris, Metternich in a note to Lord Castlereagh³ had expressed the opinion that Austria ought to have the Legations, partly on account of the agreement of Prague, arrived at on 27th July 1813, partly because the Austrian house had an "indisputable" right to that part of Italy, because the sovereign of Austria was King of Rome, hereditary Emperor and head over all Germany. Against this assertion Consalvi protested in a note of 23rd June which he sent from London to the principal powers of Europe.⁴

¹ Consalvi I, 22f.

² *Ibid.*, 25f.

³ Of 26th May 1814, printed in Bianchi I, 333f. Cp. 7.

⁴ Printed in Artaud II, 373f.

In that note he claimed the restoration of all the provinces of the Papal See which had been occupied by foreign powers, arguing that Rome in 1806 had refused to make common cause with Napoleon, and to consider Napoleon's enemies as its own;¹ and Rome had never wavered since in refusing alliance with Napoleon. The Papacy, according to Consalvi, had a complete right both to the Legations, and to Avignon and Venaissin, Benevento and Pontecorvo, even to Parma and Piacenza; for Rome had never acknowledged those princes who governed the two last-named countries, but on the contrary she had protested every St Peter's Day against the loss of them. "The Holy Father," says Consalvi, "has taken his oath to keep and defend all these lands, and he cannot do without them, if he is to occupy his old position and forward the interests of religion."

Afterwards, on 23rd October, he prepared another note,² in which he repeated the same claims and reminded England and Russia that Pius VII. had suffered so much, because he would not break with them. But further with regard to the Catholic churches of Germany—he uses the plural in order to guard against the rising idea of a German Imperial Church³—Rome had many wishes and many demands. The peace of Luneville, by which the Rhine had been fixed as the eastern frontier of France, had compensated the temporal princes who lost by the peace at the expense of the Church, and the secularisation of church property and the abolition of the spiritual principalities were the results of this peace. The church property had not since been given back, and the Holy Roman Empire had not been re-established. Next to the loss of his provinces this last misfortune weighed especially heavily upon the Pope's conscience, for the Holy Roman Empire was, as Consalvi explained in a subsequent note, "the centre of political unity and a venerable fabric of antiquity founded upon religion, the overthrow of which was one of the most deplorable works of destruction that the Revolution had committed."

Great difficulties arose as to the question of the provinces.

¹ See above, p. 285f.

² Klüber: *Uebersicht der diplomat. Verhandlungen des Wiener - Congresses* (Frankfurt 1816) III, 470f.

³ See Nielsen: *Romerkirken i det 19de Hundreedaar. Det indre Liv* I, 343f.

Louis XVIII. in the instructions given to his ambassadors had demanded that the Holy See should have not only the provinces on the Adriatic coast but also the Legations of Ravenna and Bologna.¹ But weighty voices were lifted against this project.² Prussia insisted that the Legations should be given to the King of Saxony as compensation for the lands that he had lost. Austria preferred to have the Legations herself; but as this could not be, she wished to hand them over to the Infanta Marie Louise, so as to keep her and her son away from Tuscany and Parma. But Marie Louise had promised the Pope never to receive a province which had belonged to the Holy See, and the Sardinian Court would not suffer the Pope to lose any territory for the benefit of a Bourbon princess. Russia contemplated making the three Legations into a kingdom for Eugène Beauharnais, and the Emperor Alexander I. said bitterly to Metternich, "Austria thinks she is sure of Italy; but there is a Napoleon there of whom use might be made."³ The want of agreement as to the partition of Italy was on the point of breaking up the congress, when the empire of the hundred days compelled the princes to agree.

Great consternation in Rome followed the landing of Napoleon in France.⁴ His sister, Madame Elisa, is reported to have declared at Bologna: "Bonaparte is in France; if they imprison him, we will get hold of the Pope here as a hostage." King Murat of Naples, who joined Napoleon during the hundred days, had projects of taking Pius VII. prisoner and sending him to Gaëta.⁵ He asked permission to march through the Papal States with 12,000 men, that he might join Napoleon. This was refused, and Pius considered the position of affairs so serious, that he entrusted the government of Rome to Cardinal della Somaglia and a Junta, and fled by way of Florence and Leghorn to Genoa.⁶ But he was quite cheerful. He said immediately, "This is a storm that will last for three months," and he was not far wrong.

Napoleon knew how important the friendship of the Pope was in such a difficult situation as his. He therefore sent

¹ Talleyrand II, 240.

³ Talleyrand II, 445f.

⁵ Coppi IV, 355.

² Bianchi I, 134f.

⁴ Artaud II, 415.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 401f.

Pius VII. a letter in which he represented his return "as a work of the unanimous will of a great nation."¹ He received no answer to this letter, but as he continually gave friendly assurances, and as Murat had been beaten back by the Austrians, Pius VII. resolved to return home. First, however, he paid a visit to Savona, where he crowned an image of the Madonna much revered by the people; and on the square in front of the episcopal palace, which had formerly been his prison, he received the homage of the King of Sardinia. He afterwards visited Turin, Parma, and Modena, and was everywhere greeted with veneration by princes and people.²

On 7th June he made his fourth entry into his capital after being a fugitive for seventy-eight days. Two days afterwards the Congress of Vienna determined in the 103rd article of the peace to restore to the see of St Peter the Marches, with Camerino, Benevento, and Pontecorvo, the three Legations of Ravenna, Bologna and Ferrara, with the exception of a small piece of Ferrara, situated on the left bank of the Po. Although this might well be considered an extremely favourable result, Consalvi made a protest on behalf of Pius VII. against the peace of Vienna. Rome was dissatisfied with the loss of Avignon, Venaissin, and the strip of Ferrara, and with the provision that Austria should have the right of placing troops in the Castle of Comacchio and at Ferrara.³ But the protest naturally availed nothing. Since the Bull of Innocent X. against the peace of Westphalia, people were prepared for objections of that kind. Consalvi had obtained the utmost that could possibly be obtained, and diplomatists were full of admiration for the results he had achieved. "That is the boldest and prettiest stroke that has been made on the green table," said Talleyrand to Metternich about Consalvi,⁴ and another of the diplomatists wrote: "Up to the very conclusion of the Congress Consalvi hovered between hope and fear. It is necessary to have seen him at Vienna in order to appreciate his watchfulness, his energy, and his passionate devotion to the interests of the Holy See."⁵

¹ Artaud II, 419f.

² Coppi IV, 402.

³ Klüber IV, 313f.; VI, 437f.

⁴ See the letter from Gentz in Consalvi's *Mémoires* I, 90.

⁵ Bartholdy, 60.

When Consalvi came home, the engraver, Antonio Banzo, had got a drawing by Manno engraved in all secrecy, in which the Cardinal is depicted as presenting the restored Legations to Pius VII. In this picture Consalvi is turning his eyes towards the Pope, and with his right hand points to Bologna, a kneeling figure, wearing the helmet of Minerva. Behind Pius VII. is seen, in addition to the city of Rome, Religion standing, and History seated. This idea was afterwards used by Thorvaldsen in the monument which he executed at Rome in 1824. In Thorvaldsen's beautiful bas-relief, which is placed in the Pantheon, Consalvi is seen bringing the six Papal provinces back to Pius VII. The provinces are represented as women with mural crowns. Ancona, in front, is to be recognised by the rudder; Bologna by the shield bearing the arms of the University.

After the close of the Congress of Vienna Consalvi was able quietly to resume the government, but under the most difficult conditions. It is true that Pius VII. had received nearly all his territories again, but as regards the outward position of the hierarchy things had much changed. The Pope was at that time in the position of a nobleman, whose mansion has been given back to him, but without sufficient means to enable him to lead the old life. Much less money came in, and the younger sons of the rich houses, who had formerly done service at the Papal Court for nothing, came no more, since there was no prospect of receiving rich abbeys and prebends.¹ Happily the debt of the Papal States had been considerably reduced during the French period by the abolition of the spiritual corporations. These had owned a large proportion of the bonds, which were cancelled by this abolition; and moreover the property of the corporations could be sold to meet the Papal debt. In the year 1800 the debt was 74,000,000, and in 1815 only 33,000,000,² and in the same period the income had risen from 3,000,000 to 6,000,000 or 7,000,000.

The greatest misfortune of Rome was the priestly government, and it was not easily broken up. Consalvi, at Vienna, had given the Allied Powers many promises regarding it, but

¹ Kölle: *Italiens Zukunft*, 58f.

² Bartholdy, 61, whose estimate is on the whole accepted by Gervinus II, 56.

he was not in a position to fulfil them. When he returned, Pacca had for a long time exercised a hierarchical rule in the old style, and had done everything to wipe out all traces of the French occupation. Some of the more progressive Romans, in despair at Pacca's reactionary government, had enrolled themselves in Murat's army, and were lost in his adventurous expedition; others led a life of indolence. Every fifteenth person encountered in the street was a priest or a monk; every tenth a footman in livery. Several of the Eastern, and most of the Western, orders of monks had their general offices in Rome, and there were a great number of monasteries. There was not much industry in these houses: only the English monks had the reputation of studying more, of taking more exercise, and of washing themselves more frequently than the rest.¹

Yet among the priests there were some who felt that radical changes were needed. Thus, in 1814, the Abate Giuseppe Antonio Sala presented to the Pope a quarto volume of 202 pages, which contained the first part of a complete scheme of reform (*Piano di riforma, umiliato a Pio VII.*).² Sala, who was intimately connected with Cardinal Caprara, had stayed in Paris from the conclusion of the Concordat until the coronation of the Emperor. In 1809, Pius VII., shortly before his imprisonment, appointed him secretary of the apostolic delegation at Rome, but after the French occupation of the town Sala had to flee, first to Cascia, then to the Villa Salviati near Fiesole. At Cascia he continued to correspond with the imprisoned Pope, and, when Pius VII. returned home, Sala joined him. On the journey to Rome he was master of the ceremonies to Pius VII., and later on he accompanied the Pope in his flight to Genoa.

As early as 1798 Sala wrote in his diary, of which Cugnani has published some fragments, that both the government of the Papal States and the Church itself required great reforms with regard to the ecclesiastical *personnel*.³ Such thoughts were expressed by him in the *Piano di riforma*, which in 1814 he

¹ [Kölle]: *Rom im Jahre 1833* (Stuttgart 1834), 6f.

² G. Cugnani: *Il Cardinale Giuseppe Antonio Sala*, in the *Nuova Antologia* 1880 II, 241f.

³ *Nuova Antologia*, 253.

presented in all humility to the restored Pope. He blamed the existing commixture of the sacred and the secular, and maintained that political sovereignty was not essential for the successor of St Peter. He also expressed his regret that the Papal *bullarium* contained decrees about civil affairs side by side with ecclesiastical decisions. The high places of the Church ought to be better filled; the rules of the Council of Trent ought to be closely followed in the choice of cardinals and bishops. Preachers ought to be compelled to preach Christ Jesus and Him crucified, instead of changing the pulpit into an academical chair or into a theatre; and the monastic houses of men and women ought to be reformed.

Sala's publication was sent to Vienna to Consalvi, but he showed himself very ungraciously disposed towards the *Piano*. Orders were immediately sent to Rome to stop the sale of the book, and an attempt was made to destroy the copies that were already in circulation. The destruction of the inopportune book was so effectual that Professor Cugnoni for twenty-five years sought in vain to get hold of a copy. Padre Curci relying upon Cugnoni's disclosures not long ago bitterly reproached Consalvi for his conduct,¹ and expressed the opinion that the zeal of the Papal Secretary was due to his anxiety lest he should be removed from his post by the reforming Abate, who stood in such high favour with Pius VII. This is undoubtedly an unjust accusation. Consalvi was then so highly respected, both by Pius VII. and by the whole of Europe, that he scarcely needed to fear being set aside for a man like Sala, whose name of honour, even after he at length received the purple under Gregory XVI., was "the live archives of the Holy See."² But one can quite understand that to Consalvi it would be very inopportune that voices should be raised in Rome for the separation of the spiritual and temporal power just at the very moment when he was fighting a hard battle amongst the diplomatists in order to preserve all the temporal possessions of the Papal See. Besides, most of the proposals for reform made by the Abate were neither so new

¹ C. M. Curci: *Das neue Italien und die alten Zeloten* (Leipzig 1882) II, 166f. Cp. Nippold: *Handbuch der neuesten Kirchengeschichte* (Elberfeld 1883) II, 26, who only seems to be acquainted with Sala's programme through Curci's representation.

² *Nuova Antologia*, 288.

nor so conspicuous as to provoke Consalvi's jealousy. Many of them enjoyed his full approval, but he was so much of a practical politician that he preferred rather to act than to write about affairs.

Even before he left Vienna he promulgated several laws for the settlement of the internal affairs of the recovered Legations.¹ He allowed most of the French amendments to remain in force, confirmed the sale of the national estates, and promised a new and better government.² As early as 6th July 1816 the great *Motu proprio* was published, which became a sort of Constitution for the whole of the Papal States.³ In the preface Consalvi says that Divine Providence seems to have made use of the French occupation of the country to prepare the way for uniformity and unity in the State. Unity was in his opinion the basis of every political regulation which could strengthen the government and make the people happy; therefore it was his intention to proceed in the path which the French had trodden. Both the towns and the nobility lost their old privileges, which not infrequently in past time had caused difficulties to the popes; and all monopolies and exemptions disappeared. The Papal States, on the model of the French division into departments, were divided into seventeen "delegations," and at the head of each of these a "delegate" was placed with the same power as the French prefects. By the side of the delegates there were to be provincial consultative bodies, whose members were appointed at Rome, and not by the province itself. The whole of this system was a thorough centralisation, which gave great power both to the leading men in the State and to the individual officials; and the delegates were to be prelates. The priesthood thus obtained an absolute predominance in the new settlement. With regard to the administration, the taxes, and the customs, the *Motu proprio* allowed the French arrangements to remain; in other directions, as for instance with regard to education, it promised that everything should be improved "as quickly as possible." The educational system was, however, not so bad as has often been asserted; there were at that time more than

¹ L. C. Farini: *Lo stato Romano* (Firenze 1853) I, 7f. Ranke, 79f., and Gervinus II, 49f.

² Coppi IV, 405f.

³ *Bullarium Romanum* XIV, 47f.

a hundred schools at Rome, in which instruction was given free or at very little cost.

The finances also were the object of Consalvi's care ; but they were in a hopeless condition, and they remained so. The times were past when Prince Doria could send 500,000 scudi to the Papal mint ; there were now only a few rich men at Rome, such as Torlonia and some other bankers. As early as 1816 the Budget showed a deficit of more than 100,000 scudi. The expedient was then tried of farming the taxes after the manner of Ancient Rome, and this was carried very far. For the sake of economy the feeding of the prisoners, the number of whom in 1820 rose to 11,000, was let out to private persons. The first person who undertook it received 15 soldi a day ; but he delegated his duty to others for 10 and 8 soldi, so that the prisoners were starved. The judicial procedure was as bad as the prison system. Cardinal Rivarola, as has been said above, had already, before Pius VII. returned to Rome, abolished "for ever" the French laws, and the Canon Law and the apostolical constitutions became again valid. Incredible confusion was the result, and Consalvi had to devise a new code. The part which concerned judicial procedure appeared as early as 1817, mainly by the help of the Bartolucci whose name has been mentioned before ; but the rest was never finished. Law and justice in the Papal States were still dependent therefore upon favour and chance, and the Papal grace was continually abused. "Consalvi," say the courteous *Annali d'Italia*, "began much, accomplished something, but left various matters unfinished, such as the code, the financial system, and the fund for paying off the National Debt."¹ The clear sight of the Secretary of State had perceived that a great deal of what the French Revolution had produced ought to be, and might be, preserved and imitated ; but there was no authority in Rome possessed of sufficient power, or provided with the necessary staff, to carry out the new order of things.

But who under such difficult circumstances could have done more than Consalvi ? Formerly the Church had fed both town and country ; now it needed to be supported by both, and therefore it became an object of dislike. The provinces were

¹ Coppi V, 334.

highly displeased at everything being determined at Rome, and the aristocracy missed its old privileges. To this must be added the wide division between clergy and laity, which appeared so markedly after the French occupation; and, as reasonable concessions were not made in time, this division afterwards became fatal. Farini thinks that Pius VII. might at that time have raised the banner of the Guelphs and have assumed a protectorate over all Italy;¹ but was it really possible? Pius VII. would in such a case have had to break with the Conservative powers, which were his support, and to trust himself to the people, of whom half were free-thinkers. How would such a proceeding have fitted with the agreements concerning "the outward and inward tranquillity of Italy," which were signed a few days after the closing scenes at Vienna? And is there the least likelihood that Pius VII. would have succeeded where Pius IX. failed, at a moment when reaction and restoration were in full swing in Europe? The Papal States were bound to succumb to the fate which has always overtaken every corrupt blending of politics with Christianity.

The possibility "of infusing a new spirit into Guelphism," of which Farini speaks, disappears completely, when it is seen how strong was the resistance which Consalvi had to encounter. Many libels against him were produced at Rome, which passed from hand to hand in manuscript in the Roman cafés, and he met with the strongest opposition among his own colleagues. Cardinal Albani declared openly that he felt no inclination to pay three times as much as formerly in taxes upon his estates, which were now worth only a third of what they had been; and many thought as Albani did. Pacca became the leader of a great party of *Zelanti*, who would not budge from strict ecclesiastical principles, and who secretly and openly accused Consalvi of being infected with ungodly liberalism. To this party belonged the Cardinals Castiglioni, afterwards Pius VIII., and Della Genga, afterwards Leo XII.

On account of the resistance which Consalvi always met with from the cardinals, he excluded them from any influence upon the government. Their animosity increased accordingly, and they had recourse to the fatal expedient of forming or

¹ Farini I, 9.

of favouring secret reactionary societies, which proved a great misfortune, since religion through them became a tool in the service of politics. The growing power of the Jesuits was no longer sufficient—more helpers were needed.¹ A politico-religious society called the *Pacifici* or the *Santa Unione* had long existed. Their motto was the saying of our Lord, "Blessed are the peacemakers." They swore to maintain the public peace, even if it cost them their lives. The *Sanfedisti*, as the members of the association were called, only aimed originally at defending the faith and the Pope against worldly aggressions; but afterwards these shield-bearers of absolute theocracy ventured in the name of Christianity to raise bloody persecutions against the Liberals without regard to class, sex, or age. It was at the instigation of the *Sanfedisti* that Pius VII., on 13th September 1821, promulgated a Bull against the *Carbonari*.² These, like all secret societies, delighted to derive their origin from the mysteries of the ancient world, especially from the ministers of Isis and of Mithra, but they were in reality scarcely older than the French occupation. While the French made friends in Italy through the Freemasons, the *Carbonari*, as patriotic Italians, had endeavoured to throw off the French yoke, and their society became a nursery both for the longing after liberty, and for the national feeling. In their "unbridled love of liberty" they swore upon the poison flask and upon red-hot iron to think night and day of the extirpation of tyrants, and to keep the secrets of the society, otherwise "the poison flask should be their drink, and red-hot iron should burn their flesh." At their feasts the *Carbonari* drank to each other with the words, "Death or independence," and they sang of the "blood-red star," that was rising over their country, which should be in the ascendant again, "at the cock crow, when the eagles are fighting."³

Compared with the calamities which the antagonism between the *Sanfedisti* and the *Carbonari* brought upon the Papal States, the other epidemic of brigandage was of less importance. In self-defence against the French many had been compelled to take to the mountains; and afterwards those who came into

¹ Farini I, 10.

² *Bullarium Romanum* XV, 446f.

³ Coppi V, 13, 16, 29, 212. Ranke, I 18f. Bunsen I, 176.

collision with the law sought a hiding-place there. A false spirit of romance cast a peculiar glamour over the bandits, so that the girls of Rome looked up with admiration to the men who "could live in the mountains," and their fathers as a rule did not hesitate to do business with them. By a sort of agreement Consalvi succeeded in restricting this nuisance, but it is not even yet quite eradicated.¹

But if in many respects Consalvi's home government did not reach what he aimed at, he was absolutely successful in his foreign politics. The good fortune which had smiled upon him at Vienna, never left him, and he gained by his diplomatic skill a series of victories, which proved of great importance for the position of the Roman Church in most of the European countries.

At one time it created some dissatisfaction amongst the princes,² that Pius VII. would not join the Holy Alliance, which was intended to maintain justice, love, and peace.³ This league of sovereigns, which was mainly due to Frau von Krüdener's untiring energy, was to form a substitute for the system of balance which rested upon power only, and not upon justice. This enthusiastic woman had succeeded in winning over the Emperor Alexander I. of Russia to her plan. The Tsar looked upon her as an angel, who spoke in the name of God, and she saw in him the "white angel," whose mission it was to build up all that the black angel, Napoleon, had torn down. This new alliance was to create harmony and mutual honesty; right of conquest was not to be recognised, the great armies were to be disbanded, and the era of eternal peace was to dawn. The Turks were to make it their business to stop the plague, and to treat their Christian subjects more humanely; the piratical states of North Africa were to be wiped out, and the English commercial despotism to be broken. It was the recollection of past trials and dangers, and a humble sense that the Almighty hand of God had helped them, that made the princes desirous to enter this league. But the fair words of the treaty of alliance—words which Frau von Krüdener

¹ Ranke, 102f. Wiseman, 177f.

² Bianchi I, 189f.

³ W. T. Krug: *Gesammelte Schriften* III (*La sainte alliance*), 235f. This section was written in 1816.

had only with difficulty preserved from "the unholy hands of diplomatists and courtiers,"¹—were sadly confuted in the period that followed by the acts of the alliance; it became a conspiracy of princes against the liberty of the peoples. The Holy Alliance was the expression of a feeling similar to that which, after the wars of religion, gave Henry IV. the idea of a Christian European state, in which Catholics, Lutherans, and Calvinists were to enjoy the free exercise of their religion. But the romanticism of the period cast a special glamour over the new princely alliance.

"Was hör' ich rauschen? Himlischer Sphären Klang
Tönt durch die Lüfte; seliger Geister Schaar,
Wie einst auf Bethlehems Gefilde,
Schwebet hernieder von Licht umflossen."

Thus sang the poet in his enthusiasm for the alliance, and at first the people in many places joined in; but Pius VII. maintained a cold attitude. He would not look upon "heretics" as genuine members of the Church, and he would not, as the alliance desired, give up the power of excommunication and the Inquisition.

We might have expected that a man like Consalvi, in matters pertaining to forms of faith, would have shown himself less narrow than the statesmen of the *Zelanti*, who on all points followed the dogma of the schools, and the church policy of the Middle Ages. But this was not the case; Consalvi was as intolerant in things of this kind as Pacca and the other *Zelanti*, and he had openly expressed to Louis XVIII. his dissatisfaction that the French charter should have granted liberty of worship. Niebuhr succeeded, indeed, in 1819 in obtaining permission to hold an Evangelical service in Rome once a week in the Prussian embassy, whereby the precedent was established for the services which are now held in the Palazzo Caffarelli. But general religious liberty in Rome was out of the question. The fanaticism of the Roman section of the Church against the Evangelical and against the individual

¹ Krug: *Gespräch unter vier Augen mit Frau von Krüdener* (Leipzig 1818) printed in Krug's *Ges. Schriften* III, 267f. C. Eynard: *Vie de Mme. de Krüdener* (Paris 1849) II, 93f. P. L. Jacob: *Mme. de Krüdener, ses lettres et ses ouvrages inédits* (Paris 1880), 49, 78f.

members of it, was at that period, according to Bunsen,¹ at its height. In order to proselytise amongst the Protestants residing in Rome, a French publication, the *Voix de l'église catholique aux protestants de bonne foi*, was sent to them, which Brandis, a member of the Prussian legation, answered in a letter, in which he showed that the main propositions to be proved were very poorly handled; that it was impudent ignorance to attack the character of the Reformers and their friends, and ridiculous folly to present the fathers of the Council of Trent as patterns of sanctity. Finally, Brandis set forth what intellectual and religious sacrifices were in reality demanded, before a Protestant with a good conscience could go over to the Roman section of the Church.²

The fanaticism of the leading Roman circles towards the Reformation appeared strikingly in the condemnation of the Bible Societies. Clement XI. in his time had condemned in the Bull *Unigenitus* the proposition that reading the Bible is useful for all, and that the obscurity of God's Holy Word ought not to debar Christian laymen from reading it.³ But Jansenism, on the other hand, had contributed to make even zealous Catholics take a more tolerant view of the reading of the Bible. Benedict XIV. allowed all the faithful to read the Scriptures provided they would use only an authorised version, furnished with notes taken from the fathers of the Church, or Catholic men of learning. It was, therefore, not the reading of the Bible in itself, but the free investigation of the Scriptures which was to be prohibited. Pius VI. even went so far as to write to the Abate Martini, afterwards Archbishop of Florence: "You do well to encourage the faithful to read the Divine Word, for it is the purest of fountains, and must be kept open to all the faithful, so that they may draw from it purity in morals and belief."

But when the reaction set in, and the Protestant Bible Societies gave the Curia cause for fresh alarm, new prohibitions appeared. In Poland, the authorised version put forth in 1599 by the Jesuit, Jacob Wuick, had been republished,

¹ Bunsen I, 518, in his *Denkschrift* of 1823.

² Bunsen I, 148f.

³ Propositio 80. Lectio sacræ scripturæ est pro omnibus. 81. Obscuritas sancti verbi Dei non est laicis ratio dispensandi se ipsos ab ejus lectione.

and at the same time a new translation without notes. Pius VII. took occasion to send a letter to the Archbishop of Gnesen, Metropolitan of Poland, in which he expressed his abhorrence of the crafty invention (to wit, the Bible Societies) by which the very foundations of religion are undermined (*vaferimum inventum, quo vel ipsa religionis fundamenta labefactantur*). He had sought the counsel of the cardinals to consider how "this plague" might be best cured.¹ Rome's dislike of the Bible Societies was shared by several of the leading men of the Restoration, as can be seen from Metternich's *Memoirs*.² He tells Nesselrode that he himself every day reads a chapter or two in Luther's translation,³ but nevertheless he thinks that the Roman Church acts wisely in forbidding ordinary men to read the Bible, which contains so many mysterious passages, and relates so many crimes and immoral scenes. In Austria, Catholics were allowed to read Catholic translations under the supervision of the Church, and Protestants to read their own without supervision; but Metternich was certain the Emperor would never allow a Bible Society to be formed in his empire.⁴

It was the old rancour on the part of the restored Society of Jesus that found vent in the condemnation of the Bible Societies. It was also the cause of Jesuitism and Ultramontaniam, that Consalvi furthered when in the period after the Congress of Vienna, so rich in princely meetings and princely compacts, he succeeded in concluding and introducing a whole series of agreements with the different States, so that the time after 1815 may be described as an era of Concordats.⁵ For the new Concordats were first and foremost a means of suppressing the National Church movements in Roman Catholic countries, and of eradicating all traces of Jansenism, Gallicanism, and Febronianism. Consalvi, who had learnt his diplomatic lessons during the negotiations with Bonaparte over the French Concordat, had a much easier task in the conclusion of the later agreements. He now dealt with statesmen who had a

¹ The letter is printed in Paulus : *Sophronizon* I, 236f.

² Metternich : *Nachgel. Papiere* II, 1, 58f.

³ "La meilleure qui ait jamais été faite en aucun pays et dans une langue vivante," 60.

⁴ P. 57.

⁵ Nippold II, 47f.

far greater respect for the Papacy than Bonaparte ever had, and who were far less on their guard against the artifices of Roman policy than the keen-sighted First Consul had been.

And the Concordat with Bonaparte was useful as a pattern for the later agreements. No legitimate sovereign could expect more and greater concessions than revolutionary France had obtained, and the uncompromising suppression of Gallicanism, which was the assured consequence of those terms of the French Concordat by which the old episcopate was set aside, promised the victory to Ultramontanism in all the National Churches. Consalvi at once revealed his diplomatic skill by the very order in which the Concordats were concluded. Agreements with the friendliest governments, and with countries where the Jesuits had already begun to prepare the way for a return to the old state of things, opened this era of Concordats.

In Spain Ferdinand VII. returned to the Concordat of 1753;¹ in Sardinia, the government persecuted all opponents of the Pope's Infallibility, and ten dioceses, which had been abolished by the French, were restored in 1817.² In the same year France concluded a new Concordat, by which the Concordat of 1801 was made invalid, while the old Concordat of 1516 was to come again into force.³ The suppressed bishoprics were to be restored and endowed so richly that a great part of France would again come under the dead hand; but the old rights of the Gallican Church would, by the new agreement, be in every respect kept sacred. At Rome people already rejoiced that the French Church had regained her old splendour, and Pius VII. showed his satisfaction by giving three of his legitimist antagonists among the French bishops the cardinal's hat.⁴ But before this Concordat could become law in France, it had to be sanctioned by the chambers, and that proved impossible. The *projet de loi*, which the government laid before the legislative assemblies, contained in reality just as gross a violation of the new Concordat, as the Organic Laws did of the Concordat of 1801; and fury reigned at Rome over this last exhibition of French faithlessness. And

¹ E. Münch: *Vollständige Sammlung aller Konkordate* (Leipzig 1830) I, 443f.

² Münch II, 745; Bianchi I, 285f.

³ Münch II, 54f.

⁴ O. Mejer: *Zur Geschichte der röm. deutschen Frage* (Rostock 1872) II, 148f. That work contains also a catalogue of the extensive literature connected with this Concordat.

even with the proposed restrictions, the Concordat of 1817 could not pass. Count Portalis was therefore sent to Rome to induce Pius VII. either to abandon the new Concordat altogether or to alter the articles objected to, so that there might be some hope of carrying the matter through. But all his efforts were fruitless. The Curia would go no further than to promise a suspension of the new Concordat until circumstances in France were changed. After the negotiations had been in abeyance for six months, Portalis renewed them under the ministry of Richelieu; but Rome would not make any more concessions than before. In 1819 a temporary suspension of the new Concordat was agreed upon, by which the Concordat of 1801 again came into force for the time being.¹ And Pius VII. to the last held to this view of the arrangement of 1819, as being merely temporary.²

The course of things in Bavaria was very similar. With that state also Rome made a most favourable arrangement in 1817.³ But here again opposition did not fail to declare itself,⁴ and the government had to give way to the storm, by appending to the new Constitution an Edict which assured to the Protestants establishment and guarantees;⁵ since that time the government of Bavaria has halted between submission to the Concordat and loyalty to the Constitution. By a clever use of the fear of the Revolution, which possessed the Neapolitan reigning family, Consalvi at last succeeded, in 1818, in making a Concordat with Naples, which contained all the concessions that Rome could reasonably wish for.⁶ The Revolution of 1820 certainly caused a temporary breach between Rome and Naples, but in 1821 the Concordat again came into force.

Things did not go so smoothly with the Protestant governments. The Republican Constitution of the Netherlands had brought with it religious liberty, but under Napoleon the affairs of the Roman Catholic Church had not been settled, although the Emperor had made several offers in that direction

¹ *Bullarium Romanum* XV, 239. Speech of Pius VII. in a secret consistory of 23rd August 1819.

² Compare the Circumscription Bull of 6th October 1822, *Bullarium Romanum* XV, 577f.

³ Münch II, 217f.

⁴ O. Mejer II, 87f.

⁵ Münch II, 226f.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 708f. Bianchi I 274f.

while Pius VII. was a prisoner at Savona.¹ Immediately after the Restoration, William I. expressed his wish to conclude a Concordat with Rome, which after being sanctioned by the estates should form part of the Constitution of the Netherlands. The negotiations were opened by Count Reinhold and continued by De Celles; but it was not until 18th July 1827 that a conclusion was reached, by which the French Concordat of 1801 was extended to Belgium; three new bishoprics were created, and the appointment of the Roman Catholic bishops was taken away from the non-Catholic King.

At the Vienna Congress there had been an inclination to form a free German National Church,² and during the negotiations which took place in 1818 at Frankfort between the states which composed the ecclesiastical province of the Upper Rhine, an echo of Febronianism was still heard. Metternich wished that all the German federal states should conclude a common Concordat with Rome,³ and he made overtures in that direction, but they were without result. On the other hand, the several Protestant states in Germany made arrangements and Concordats of their own with the Pope. Frederic William III. sent to Rome the great historical pioneer, Niebuhr, as the representative of Prussia,⁴ and Niebuhr obtained in 1821 an agreement with Rome which the Pope himself called *mirificum*. Niebuhr, who was critical enough in other things, was completely convinced of the *Harmlosigkeit* of the Papal Court;⁵ and he was a bitter antagonist of Febronianism and of Jansenism. Therefore the agreement which he introduced, and which was concluded by Hardenberg himself during his stay at Rome,⁶ was especially favourable for the Papacy.

The only Catholic power which did not make a new agree-

¹ O. Mejer: *Die Propaganda, ihre Provinzen und ihr Recht* (Göttingen 1853) II, 97f. Nippold: *Die röm. kath. Kirche im Königreich der Niederlande* (Leipzig 1872), 149f.

² Nielsen: *Det indre Liv* I, 343f.

³ *Nachgelassene Papiere* II, 1, 3f.

⁴ As regards the relations between Prussia and Rome in the beginning of the nineteenth century, see A. Frantz in the *Deutsche Zeitschrift f. Kirchenrecht*, 1892, 19f.

⁵ O. Mejer: *Zur röm. deutschen Frage* III, 1, 101. In 1824 Niebuhr wrote to Bunsen: "Der Katholicismus hält sich nur durch die absolute Indifferenz der höheren Stände für wirkliche Religion. Mit den Bedürfnissen des 16 Jahrhunderts verschwände er von der Erde." Bunsen I, 220.

⁶ Mejer, 163.

ment with the Pope was Austria; for over this country there still hung in matters relating to the Church something of the spirit of Joseph II. But the Emperor Francis I. came to Rome in 1819 with his consort, his daughter, Prince Metternich, and a splendid retinue, to visit Pius VII. and to demonstrate his affection and reverence for him. It was a welcome visit, and it would have been still more welcome if the Papal Treasury had not been completely empty. Pius VII. was obliged, curiously enough, to borrow some of the money for the festivities arranged for Francis I. and Metternich, from Madame Letitia Bonaparte and the Princess Pauline. The remainder was raised by the collecting of outstanding debts, and by the conclusion of unfortunate leases.¹ During the visit of the imperial couple to Rome the friendship between Consalvi and Metternich was renewed, and shortly afterwards the Austrian minister, on his way to Karlsbad, gave his Roman colleague good advice. "Crush intriguers and you diminish intrigues. You may in every respect rely upon us for help in the good cause;" so runs the letter of Metternich. "The intimate understanding that exists between our two governments will serve mightily for the preservation of peace, and the gates of hell will not prevail against it."² But Metternich, as we learn from his *Memoirs*, was anything but edified by his stay in Rome. He writes from there to his wife: "I confess that I do not comprehend how a Protestant can become a Catholic at Rome—Rome is like a most splendid theatre, but it has the poorest of actors. Keep my remark to yourself, for otherwise it will go the round of Vienna, and I am too much interested in religion and its victory to wish in any way to make an attack upon it."³

Other princely personages followed the example of Francis I.,⁴ as the Kings of Naples and of Prussia. Prince Christian of Denmark also, and Princess Caroline Amalie, visited Rome; amongst Consalvi's letters there are letters of gratitude from them both for the kindness which the Cardinal had shown them during their stay in the Eternal City. It was during their visit that Thorvaldsen came into closer

¹ Gervinus II, 57.

² Consalvi I, 126f.

³ Metternich: *Nachgelassene Papiere* II, I, 194.

⁴ Wiseman, 203f.

contact with Consalvi and the Roman clergy.¹ But besides these guests Rome had several exiled kings constantly within her walls. Both Charles IV. of Spain and Charles Emmanuel IV. of Savoy had taken up their abode there, and the family of Napoleon also for a long time found an asylum at Rome.

But it was above all the devotees of art and science who flocked to the city of St Peter, where antiquity and the Middle Ages meet. It was Consalvi's idea to make Rome the metropolis of the world as the city of art, since it no longer seemed able to be the world's mistress; artists therefore were held in high honour. Canova was highly regarded both by Pius VII. and by his Secretary of State, and Thorvaldsen was able to create his masterpieces there, admired and honoured by all. During Consalvi's time it was chiefly sculpture that flourished in Rome; afterwards it was painting. In 1817, and often afterwards, the Crown Prince Ludvig of Bavaria visited the city to refresh his spirit by gazing at its art treasures. He acquired the Villa Malta on the Monte Pincio and lived amongst the antiquities of the Eternal City, surrounded by artists such as Cornelius, Julius Schnorr von Karolsfeld, Overbeck, Catel, Thorvaldsen, and the architect, Leo von Klenze.² Rome also contained men of learning in great numbers. Several of the representatives of foreign powers, such as Niebuhr and Bunsen, have acquired a greater name in the history of knowledge than in that of diplomacy.

But the city of St Peter was not allowed to be only an asylum for Church and art; under Pius VII. there were already forebodings of new storms. In 1816 the Pope said to Artaud, when the conversation turned upon the recently published *Motu proprio*: "The people are difficult to deal with nowadays."³ He had reason to observe how the difficulties increased year by year. In 1817 the *Carbonari* made an unsuccessful attempt to seize the town of Macerata, and two years afterwards it came to light that they had designs upon Rome itself. An Italian officer named Illuminati, brought a couple

¹ J. M. Thiele: *Thorvaldsen i Rom* II., 187.

² L. von Kobell: *Unter den vier ersten Königen Bayerns* (München 1894) I, 113f. Cp. Bunsen I, 141f.

³ Artaud II, 484.

of letters to the post-office. The postmaster noticed that the man was uneasy; he therefore opened the letters. They contained information for fellow-members of a lodge, composed in enigmatic language. Illuminati was tortured, but he would confess nothing. He would not eat, in order to meet death without confessing. Then came a letter to him from his mistress at Venice, and love conquered politics. The desire of life returned; he ate, and confessed. It appeared from his disclosures that there was a network of conspiracy over the whole peninsula.¹

When Spain in 1820 proclaimed the Constitution of 1812, a revolutionary movement was felt throughout the whole of Italy. In Naples the army demanded the Spanish Constitution of 1812, and a revolution broke out in Sicily. In the south of Italy the rising was directed against the tyranny of the King; in the north against foreign dominion. "The kingdom of Italy! Independence!" was the watchword in Piedmont. In the midst between these two revolutionary streams lay the Papal States, whose sovereign could never rule according to a Constitution, and whose minister was a friend of Metternich. In the enclaves of the Papal States, Benevento and Pontecorvo, people were already planting trees of liberty, and a declaration was published which stated that it was the will of the people of Benevento to live and die free, and in union with Naples.² In Rome rings were sold with death's heads and other emblems of the *Carbonari*; in the Legations, where the French rule had left behind it a revolutionary seed ready to sprout, the members of the secret societies held meetings in out-of-the-way places of the woods, and sang: "We are all soldiers of liberty!" A fictitious proclamation was spread abroad, in which the Pope promised for the future to govern according to "the Spanish Constitution, the gospel, and the Council of Trent." It even seemed for a moment as if Consalvi's opponents, the most reactionary cardinals and the Liberals, would unite in a *costituzione cardinalizia*, formed after the Spanish model, which had very attractive features for the priesthood, because it forbade the exercise of any other religion than the Catholic, and surrounded the elections with religious ceremonies.

Consalvi weathered the storm by keeping cool, and by

¹ Ranke, 127f.

² *Ibid.*, 129.

combining firmness with clemency. During the carnival season, troubles broke out in the Legations, but when the Austrians appeared, matters became quiet again. The Holy Alliance succeeded in smothering the revolts in the southern peninsulas of Europe, and Jansenism which had boldly raised its head in the Spanish Cortes and in the Portuguese court circles received thereby its death-blow. The victory of the alliance, however, was not an unmixed pleasure to Pius VII. He, like the rest of the Italian sovereigns, received much good advice regarding his government which Consalvi would not accept. It hurt him to see St Peter's successor placed on an equal footing with the princes of Tuscany and Modena. A Bull was promulgated in 1821, as we have seen, against the *Carbonari*, but from that moment Consalvi became more distant towards Metternich; whereupon the secret agents of Austria in Rome spoke with the greatest bitterness of the Cardinal, "who forgot the instructions he had received from the Allied Powers in 1815." The condition of affairs in Rome was described as "demoralisation in things spiritual, disorder and corruption in things temporal," and Roman politics as a mixture of Pharisaism and Machiavellism.¹ We cannot wonder therefore that Austria, when a rumour of the Pope's failing health was circulated looked about for a candidate for the Papal chair, and would on no account have Consalvi elevated to the Papacy. Louis XVIII. on the contrary trusted Consalvi more and more, and the Orleanists also leaned towards Rome. Louis Philippe in 1822 wrote in his paternal style to Consalvi, that his wife and he were "happy in inculcating upon their young family affection for the see of St Peter," and as a token of his great respect for the Cardinal he sent him some flowers, because he had learned from Talleyrand that Consalvi was a great lover of flowers.²

In the same year that the Pope issued the Bull against the *Carbonari*, the captive Emperor died. The pious Pope had never forgotten him. In October 1817 he wrote from Castel Gandolfo to Consalvi: "The Emperor Napoleon's family has informed me through Cardinal Fesch that the climate of the rocky island of St Helena is deadly, and that the poor exile sees his strength

¹ The despatch in Della Gattina IV, 318.

² Consalvi I, 151f.

ebbing away with every minute. This news has caused me unspeakable sorrow, and you will no doubt share it with me ; for we must both remember that, next to God, we owe it to him that religion was re-established in the great French Empire. Savona and Fontainebleau were only spiritual delusions or errors, due to human ambition ; the Concordat was a saving act, full of Christian courage. . . . It would be to my heart a joy like nothing else, if I could help in lessening Napoleon's sufferings. He can no longer be dangerous to anyone. I only wish that he may not cause anybody remorse."¹ It was language worthy of a Christian. Pius VII. was minded to write to the Allied Powers, and especially to the Prince Regent of England, and he requested Consalvi also to intercede with that Prince, who was the Cardinal's "dear and good friend." In a letter of 18th May 1818, Madame Letitia thanks the Pope for all that he has done for her "great, unhappy, proscribed one in St Helena" ; she feels herself like the "mother of all sorrows," and her only consolation is that Pius VII. has forgotten the past, so that he now only thinks of her and her children with kindness.²

The news received from St Helena was always sad. Pius VII. had sent to Napoleon a priest, the Abbé Vignali, who was to bring him the consolations of religion ; but there was nothing to indicate that misfortune and downfall had brought the Emperor to the Christian faith. He ordered, however, the Sacrament to be exhibited in the sick-room, and just before his death he received Extreme Unction.³ His will opens with the words, "I die in the bosom of the Apostolic and Roman Church ;" and he wished to have the observances of the Roman Church followed at his funeral. When his doctor scoffed at this he said : "Young man ! You are perhaps too clever to believe in God ; I am not so advanced as that. Not all can be atheists." A few days before his death he said : "I shall see my generals again. They will meet me ; they will yet again feel the excitement there is in earthly glory. We will speak of what we have achieved ; we will converse about our art with Frederick, Turenne, Condé, Cæsar, and Hannibal, unless people up there, like those here below, should be afraid of seeing so many warriors in one

¹ The letter is in Consalvi I, 90f. Cp. Bianchi I, 265f.

² Consalvi I, 116f.

³ Lyonnet : *Le Cardinal Fesch* II, 658f.

place." Thus it was a modern Valhalla that he looked for, and Mme. de Rémusat is scarcely wrong, when she says that Napoleon attached greater importance to the immortality of his name than to that of his soul.¹

At last, on 5th May, whilst storm and rain raged outside, he breathed his last after a terrible death struggle. "My son—the army—Desaix," were the few words that could be caught, and it has been gathered from them that the dying Emperor's last thoughts dwelt upon Marengo. As soon as the news of his death was received at Rome, Pius VII. ordered Cardinal Fesch to hold a memorial service, as a sign that Napoleon had died at peace with the Church,² and the Italians sang Manzoni's song, *Il cinque Maggio*, with the verse:

"Il Dio, che atterra e suscita,
Che affanna e che consola,
Sulla deserta cultrice
Accanto a lui posò."

Pius VII. did not survive him long. On 6th July 1823, in the evening, he fell on the floor in his chamber in the Quirinal, and was obliged to keep his bed. While he lay ill, a disaster occurred, which to the Romans was an omen of the Pope's death: the Church of San Paolo outside the walls was burned down.³ It was the most beautiful Basilica of Rome, built under Theodosius, with five aisles, divided by Corinthian columns. In the monastery by San Paolo Pius VII. had spent his youth as a quiet monk in literary occupations, and he loved that church. While it was burning, he was so ill that they dared not tell him about it. He grew weaker day by day, and he was prepared for the coming of death. The Emperor of Austria sent him old Tokay, and Louis XVIII. presented him with an ingeniously contrived mechanical bed to lessen his sufferings. On 17th August he made his communion, and on the 19th he received Extreme Unction; and in all the churches of Rome prayers were offered for the dying Pope, who in a gentle voice continually repeated the words: "Savona—Fontainebleau."⁴ It

¹ *Mémoires* II, 369.

² Artaud II, 577.

³ The particulars about the fire may be found in Bunsen I, 206f. Coppi V, 320.

⁴ Artaud II, 604.

is a beautiful story that Pius VII. in his last illness would not bear the usual mode of address, "Most Holy Father," and said, "No, call me 'poor sinner.'"¹ On 17th August he died calmly and quietly, absorbed in prayer. Consalvi, who was himself ill with fever, had risen from his bed to watch the last three nights by his sovereign.² As soon as Pius breathed his last, he fell upon his knees at the bedside and watered the dead man's feet with his tears.

With the death of Pius VII. Consalvi's rule came to an end. At the first meeting of the cardinals jealousy and ill-will towards the powerful Secretary of State were immediately displayed, but Cardinal Fesch defended him.³ Cardinals della Somaglia and Ruffo received orders to prepare everything for a new Conclave, and while Masses were said for the deceased Pope, thoughts were eagerly turned towards finding the best man to succeed him. Consalvi never attempted to play a part again; all his thoughts were concentrated upon raising a worthy monument to his dead master. In his will of 1st August 1822,⁴ he had appointed a sum of 20,000 Roman florins for this purpose. The execution was to be entrusted to Canova or to Thorvaldsen, and if neither could undertake the work, to one of the best sculptors in Rome. The monument was to consist of three statues: over the urn the statue of the Pope, and by his side two figures, representing heavenly Strength and heavenly Wisdom.

As Canova died shortly after the will was made, the execution was entrusted to Thorvaldsen.⁵ One day in November, while he was occupied in working at his *Angel of Baptism*, he was summoned to the Vatican, and was there commissioned by Consalvi to execute the monument of Pius VII. He was greatly pleased with this task; contrary to his usual custom, he stopped his friends in the street and told them of his good fortune. He made several sketches. First he represented the Pope sitting with a palm-branch in his hand, while two angels carried a crown of stars above his head. It was unfortunate, for palm and crown

¹ Henke: *Pabst Pius VII.* (Marburg 1860), 35.

² Bunsen I, 210.

³ Artaud II, 609.

⁴ Printed in Consalvi I, 197f.

⁵ J. M. Thiele: *Thorvaldsen i Rom* II, 187f.

are the attributes of saints, and Pius VII. was not a saint. Then he represented the Pope sitting, weighed down by his many sufferings, with the triple crown, which he had taken off, standing beside him.¹ It was Pius VII. at Savona and Fontainebleau; but what was desired was Pius VII. at Rome. At last he made a third sketch, in which the Pope sat, clothed in his heavy cope embroidered with the instruments of the Apostles' martyrdom, and his right hand uplifted to bless the people, and his left foot advanced for them to kiss. The face had the mild and gentle expression of the pious Pope, and contemporaries considered the likeness striking. The model for this monument, which was finished in 1825, was generally admired. But zealous Catholics were dissatisfied; they thought it was a scandal that a heretic should execute a monument to the Head of the Church in the chief sanctuary of Roman Catholic Christendom, and they hoped that Thorvaldsen, as usual, would not be ready in time. But this spurred the great artist on. The monument was ready at the appointed time and was unveiled on 2nd April 1831.²

¹ The sketch is to be seen in the Thorvaldsen Museum at Copenhagen, Room XXXIII, No. 149.

² Gregorovius (*die Grabdenkmäler der Päpste*, 179f.) finds the monument "fast zu protestantisch" and says: "Ueberhaupt fügt sich dieses Grabmal nicht gut in die grossen Verhältnisse des Sanct Peter, und wenn es an natürlicher Einfachheit des Stils Canovas Grabmal für Clemens XIII. übertrifft, so muss es ihm doch an kräftiger Wirkung weit nachstehn." To the first part of this criticism there is certainly nothing to be said.

PRINTED AT THE EDINBURGH PRESS,
9 AND 11 YOUNG STREET



DATE DUE

JUN 15 1971

JUN 15 1971

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

5-30.00

line set,
scarce.

BX1386 .N667 v.1

The history of the papacy in the XIXth

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00019 5059